REPORT

ON

THE LEGAL AFFAIRS

OF THE

BENGAL GOVERNMENT

FOR THE YEAR

1886-87.

Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE BENGAL SECRETARIAT PRESS.

1887

No. 502.

FROM T. T. ALLEN, ESQ.,

Superintendent and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,

TO THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL,

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Dated Calcutta, the 15*th July* 1887.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to submit, for the information of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, my report on the result of civil litigation, in which Government was concerned, during the last official year 1886-87.

1. Grish Chandra Maiti,
versus
Bhupendro Narayan Roy, minor under the Court of Wards.
2. Kailas Chandra Roy,
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council.
3. Raja Upendra Narayan Roy,
versus
Bhupendro Narayan Roy, minor under the Court of Wards.
4. Kali Kissen Tagore,
versus
The Secretary of State and Moulvi Moazim Hossein.
5. Maharanee Surrut Sundari Debee,
versus
The Secretary of State.
No. 5 *of* 1887.
6. The Secretary of State, appellant.
versus
The Maharaja of Durbhunga.

2. On the 31st of March 1886, the cases noted in the margin, were pending in Her Majesty's Privy Council. During the year under review only one case was instituted—that against the Maharajah of Durbhunga on the 26th February 1887. Printed notes for the guidance of the Solicitor at home in all these excepting the last two cases have been sent to our Solicitor in London. Paper books of these two cases not having been received, no notes have been prepared.

3. The following is the result of Government litigation in all the courts of Bengal, wherein Government was a party during the last year, as compared with that of the two previous years :—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government	...	448	576	742
Decided against Government	...	148	92	167
Compromised, remanded, or withdrawn	...	102	340	142
Percentage in favour of Government	...	75	86¼	81½

4. The percentage in favour of Government is nearly the same as in the preceding year. The increase in the number of cases is owing to a large number of land acquisition cases in connection with the Kidderpore Wet-dock having been decided during the year.

5. The result of Government litigation in the High Court during 1886-87, as compared with that of the two previous years, is shewn as follows:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government	...	24	28	30
Decided against Government	...	1	4	77
Compromised, remanded, or withdrawn	...	4	305	2
Percentage in favour of Government	...	96	87½	28

6. This low percentage of cases favourable to Government in 1886-87 is due to sixty-six cases, rent appeals of Malinaggur in the district of Mozufferpore,

A

having been decided against Government by two decisions of the High Court. A very large number of suits for enhancement of rents had been instituted on the part of Government. The Judge in appeal decreed these suits in favour of Government, and out of a large number of cases only 66 cases came up to the High Court in special appeals. Extract from the judgment of the High Court in one set of the cases which governed the rest is—

"There is no evidence to prove that the enhanced rate of rent claimed by the plaintiff is legally recoverable by him under the Rent Act."

"Then there is absolutely no evidence that the lands spoken of by the witnesses are lands possessing similar advantages to those of the defendants."

If these 66 cases governed by two decisions be treated as two cases, there were only thirteen cases decided against Government during the year, and the percentage in comparison with favourable cases would be about 70 instead of 28 as shewn in the comparative table.

Jessore.

No. 75 of 1884.

Kali Prasanna Roy, defendant, appellant.

versus.

The Secretary of State for India in Council, plaintiff, respondent.

No. 211 of 1884.

Kali Prasanna Roy, defendent, appellant.

versus.

The Secretary of State for India in Council, plaintiff, respondent.

7. The facts of these cases are:—In 1837 or before that year a chur accreted to villages Kholaberia and Makrail in the Modhumati river in Narail, which was resumed in 1838 under Regulation II of 1819. From that time the chur continued under temporary settlements till 1856, when it was surveyed by the Revenue authorities. The last settlement of chur Kholaberia was made with Baboo Chunder Coomar Roy of Narail for 20 years commencing from 1869; but in 1872 the chur disappeared, the river having shifted its course. In 1876-77 it reformed on the old site. In 1877-78 there was a dispute as to possession between the former settlement-holder Baboo Chunder Coomar Roy and the defendants Kaliprosunno Roy and others. The case was disposed of by the Joint-Magistrate of Magurah in February 1878, under section 530 of the Criminal Procedure Code, who gave possession of the chur to the defendants; and in consequence the farmer, Chunder Coomar Roy, relinquished his farm from the beginning of 1879-80. A canoongoe was then sent to the estate to collect rent and take khas possession on the part of Government, but the defendants obstructed him. Suits were instituted on behalf of Government in 1881 to obtain possession of the land as being reformation on the old site of Government chur and the dried up bed of the Madhumati, a large and navigable river. There were four suits instituted, in all of which the Subordinate Judge of Jessore in December 1883 gave partial decrees in favour of Government, disallowing only our claim for the lands forming the dry bed of the river. The Subordinate Judge, however, found in his judgment that, Government was the proprietor of these lands, and that under the provisions of Regulation XI of 1825, they could be assessed with Government revenue to be paid by the defendants.

Against this judgment four appeals were preferred—one to the High Court, and three to the District Judge's Court. One of the appeals in the District Court in which Kaliprossuno Roy was appellant was transferred to the High Court on application, and both the appeals were tried together. The same evidence which was considered by the court below to be sufficient and conclusive on behalf of the plaintiff, and upon which the Subordinate Judge gave Government decrees, was considered by the High Court to be insufficient. Messrs. Wilson and Porter, J.J. held that although there was evidence to show that the land in dispute was resumed in 1838, that is, before diluvion, and was in undisputed possession of Government for over 20 years, there was no sufficient proof of the identity of the land claimed with that resumed in 1838 and surveyed in 1856. They said: "It is sought on behalf of Government to identify these churs with the old ones that have been diluviated. Had there been any land marks in the thak maps of these churs, the identification would have been more easy; but as the matter stands, it appears to us that each successive amin has simply taken the thak maps and endeavoured to the best of his ability to adapt them to the altered features of the country. If any tree or shrub happened to be situated at or near what might be a trijunctional point, it was at once said to have been used as such at the time of the survey, when as a matter of fact the survey maps

show no land marks of this or any other kind. We are of opinion, therefore, that the lands now claimed by Government have not been properly identified with the lands resumed in 1838, or with those surveyed in 1856." They accordingly decreed the appeals and reversed the judgment of the lower court.

Shahabad.
No. 361 of 1885.
The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, appellant,
versus
Shah Mohiuddin Ahmed, plaintiff, respondent.

8. The particulars of this case were fully stated in paragraph 35 of this office Annual Report for 1884-85. On appeal the High Court (Messrs. Wilson and Porter, J.J.) agreed with the views of the court below and dismissed our appeal. A copy of the judgment of the High Court has been sent to Government with this office No. 974, dated 18th November 1886. The Court below ordered that the Government should bear its own costs; but the High Court varied that order and made the properties not decreed to the plaintiff bear the costs of Government in the court below, and the properties decreed to the plaintiff were made liable for the costs incurred in the High Court. The judgment of the High Court is in favour of Government as regards cost.

Bhagulpore.
No. 402 of 1885.
The Secretary of State for India in Council, plaintiff, appellant,
versus
Asman Singh and others, defendants, respondents.

No. 399 of 1885.
Asman Singh and others, defendants, appellants,
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council, plaintiff, respondent.

9. These two appeals were preferred by both the parties against the same judgment of the Subordinate Judge of Bhagulpore, in the case of the Secretary of State *versus* Asman Singh and others.

The facts of this case are:—The plaintiff is the proprietor of the estate called Mohazi Bhowanundpore, and the defendants are owners of mouzah Isakpore. In 1862 the owners of 15½ annas of Isakpore brought a suit against Government, and the settlement-holders of Mohazi Bhowanundpore, alleging that their mouzah, which lay on the north of the Ganges, and had been gradually cut away by the encroachment of the river disappearing entirely in 1848, had reformed on its southern bank; that Government thereupon took possession of the newly-formed lands, and made settlements of them as part of Bhowanundpore; that the river returned in 1856 to its old bed, and that the lands of Isakpore which had been diluviated reformed on their original site, and that they were entitled to recover possession. On the 13th June 1865, they obtained a decree, which was confirmed on appeal, and on the 26th April 1868 they obtained possession of certain land, through the court, but without the knowledge of the Government. The Government therefore in this suit sought to recover possession of 2,169 bighas of land, which not being included in the decree of 1865, but forming a part and parcel of Mohazi Bhowanundpore, were wrongfully taken possession of by the defendants in April 1870, that is, about two years after delivery of possession through the court.

The defendants contended that the lands in dispute belonged to their estate Isakpore; that they formed the subject-matter of their suit of 1862; that in consequence the present suit was barred by section 13 of the Civil Procedure Code, and that they were not bound by the survey maps of 1846 and 1865.

The Subordinate Judge of Bhagulpore found on evidence that the disputed land, with the exception of a small triangular piece, was outside the boundary covered by the decree of 1865, that it appertained to the estate Bhowanundpore, and that section 13 was no bar to the hearing of the present case. He accordingly decreed the Government claim, excepting the triangular piece of land above noted. As regards mesne profits, which was claimed for 13 years, the Subordinate Judge only allowed them from the date of the institution of the suit to the date of delivery of possession.

The High Court (Messrs. Wilson and O'Kinealy, J.J.) held that from the evidence adduced by both parties, it should be inferred that the land in dispute was covered by the decree obtained by the defendants in the suit of 1862, and that the claim on behalf of the Secretary of State wholly failed. They accordingly allowed the defendants' appeal and dismissed that of Government, with costs in both the courts. As the survey shows that the total area of Isakpore was only 412 bighas, such a result cannot be accepted, and an appeal to Her Majesty in Council has been preferred.

Mozufferpore.
No. 514 of 1885.
The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, appellant.
versus
Maharajah Luchmessur Sing of Durbhunga, plaintiff, respondent.

10. The circumstances of this case were reported in paragraph 46 of last year's report. Our appeal to the High Court has been dismissed by Wilson and Porter, J. J., in a judgment exceedingly brief, and which I have been told by the Advocate-General, omits all notice of the arguments used by him.

The following extracts contain the only apparent reasons for this dismissal:—

"It is a significant fact that all the other landed property acquired by the stud was held under pottahs, but with regard to this property no pottah is forthcoming, and doubts have always been expressed by the Government officers whether any proper title has been acquired thereto. It must be borne in mind that the village was acquired as an outlying farm for the purpose of pasturage and for growing oats. There can be little doubt as pointed out by the learned Counsel for the respondent that, if the stud officers had found the land unsuitable for the purposes required, or if the village had been swept away by the river, Government might have given back the property to the Maharajah, who could not possibly have established as against Government any agreement to hold the village in perpetuity at a fixed rate of rent."

"The fact that the Government has held a valuable property for more than 80 years at a very low rate of rent, and was permitted to do so without demur so long as the land was required for the public purpose for which it was originally granted, viz., for the purposes of the stud, does not, now that the stud has been abolished, afford any answer to the claim of the Maharajah as proprietor of the estate to recover back his property."

Moorshedabad.
No. 122 of 1886.
Srijeeb Chunder Sircar and others, plaintiffs, appellants.
versus.
The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, respondent.

11. The facts of this case are that the plaintiffs are the patnidars of taraf Mohakala under Messrs. Watson and Company, the present proprietors of the estate, and are defendants in the present case; that a portion of mouzah Kamardear belonging to the above mehal was washed away by the action of the river Khurrea, but it again reformed in 1845, when Government, without the knowledge of the plaintiffs, resumed some 375 bighas under Regulation II of 1819; that when the appeal against the resumption proceedings was pending before the Commissioner, certain lands accreted on the east of the aforesaid 375 bighas, and the whole land was measured to be 899 bighas. That this case having been remanded for fresh enquiry by the Commissioner in 1858, an amicable agreement was come to by which the Government relinquished all claims to the land except the 375 bighas first resumed. Accordingly the 375 bighas, were settled with the proprietor of the parent estate in 1859 for 10 years, and at the expiration of that period it was again settled in 1869 for 10 years. Subsequently in 1879, Government measured some 318 bighas odd cottahs of lands to the east of the resumed land along with it. The plaintiffs objected and appealed to the Superior Revenue authorities, but without success; and, consequently they brought this suit to recover possession of the above 318 bighas of land with mesne profits.

The defendant urged that the disputed land was an accretion to the resumed land, and as such, Government was entitled to make a settlement of it; and, also that it did not fall within the land relinquished by Government in 1858.

The District Judge found that the plaintiffs have not only given no evidence of reformation on original site, but have not even identified to the satisfaction of the Court the particular strip claimed, and he accordingly dismissed the plaintiffs' claim.

The High Court on appeal held that the result of the settlement come to in 1858, was that Government retained only 375 bighas and relinquished the rest, and that the land sued for by the plaintiffs was outside the 375 bighas retained by Government.

With regard to the objection on behalf of Government that the lands now in suit were accretions to the 375 bighas retained by Government, the High Court held that the intention of Government in the settlement of 1858, was that the plaintiffs would get all lands up to the river frontage.

On the above finding the High Court decreed the plaintiffs' claim with costs and mesne profits for three years at Rs. 33 per annum.

Sarun.
No. 519 of 1885.
Gunput Narain and 19 others, plaintiffs appellants,
versus.
Kuldeep Narain and the Secretary of State for India in Council, defendants, respondents.

12. This was a suit to set aside a sale for arrears of Government revenue held by the Collector of Sarun on the 25th of September 1883. The plaintiffs allege that the sale was illegal, having been made contrary to provisions of Act XI of 1859, that is, the provisions of sections 6, 7, and 20 of the Act not having been duly complied with. They also say that in accordance with the Collector's order of 24th September 1883, the arrears of Government revenue (Rs. 1-5-9) had been paid by them into the Government Treasury before the sale, and consequently the sale held after such payment was contrary to law; that the property had been sold for much less than its market value, and that therefore they sustained substantial loss from such sale. They claimed mesne profits for the time during which the auction-purchaser has been in wrongful possession of the property sold.

We pleaded that the provisions of Act XI of 1859 were fully complied with; that the property was duly advertised for sale for a subsisting arrear, that it was sold on the 25th of September 1883; that the Collector was under no legal obligation to postpone the sale, or exempt the estate from sale on that date; that he had passed no order accepting the tender of payment, and that no receipt of such payment was produced before him in accordance with his order of the 24th September 1883. We also urged that the plaintiffs could not legally raise objections before the Civil Court which they did not take before the Commissioner on appeal.

The District Judge of Sarun held that there were no irregularities under sections 6, 7, and 20 of the Act in connection with the sale. A general order by the Collector, dated the 24th September 1883, on which the plaintiffs chiefly relied, runs thus: "Applications for exemption on the ground of payment will be received up to 1-30 P.M.; but they must be supported by Treasury receipts for payment in full of all demands. No application will be received, and no payment will be accepted after the sale is commenced. The Treasury Officer is requested to see that all payments are taken at the Treasury without delay, and he is requested to note such payment in the sale-book." In accordance with this order one of the plaintiffs who was present and heard of the advertisement of sale put in a petition to the Collector, asking that the payment of the arrear might be accepted. The order on this petition was:—"Accept on payment of all Government demand." No doubt the arrear was paid in on the 25th September, but whether before or after 1-30 P.M., is not quite clear; but as no receipt of payment was produced at the time of sale, the estate was put up in its turn and knocked down. The Judge held there was no irregularity or illegality in such a proceeding. He therefore dismissed the suit with costs. On appeal the High Court (Messrs. Wilson and O'Kinealy J.J.) held that the Collector had no right to sell the property when he, by his special order of the 25th September 1883 on the petition of one of the plaintiffs tendering the payment of the arrear, exempted the estate from sale. His order on the petition was fully complied with by the payment of the arrear before the sale took place, and this would never have taken place had the Treasury officer done his duty by making the proper entry in the sale-book. They accordingly reversed the lower court's judgment and set aside the sale, making Government and the auction-purchaser liable for the costs of the plaintiffs in the first court and Government alone for the cost in the High Court.

This was a case which should never have come into the Civil Court. Admitting even that the Collector was within the law, the sale of a valuable property on account of an arrear of less than Rs. 2 was so harsh a proceeding that in my opinion the Commissioner or Board should have interfered and cancelled the sale before it became final. After it became final the purchaser had rights which could not be ignored; but seeing the expense imposed on Government in the present instance, I have suggested to the Board whether the established practice of Government defending the validity of revenue sales impeached in the Civil Court should any longer be maintained.

Bhagulpore.
Miscellaneous appeal No 238 of 1886.
Asman Sing, judgment-debtor, appellant.
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council, respondent.

13. This is an appeal against the order of the Subordinate Judge of Bhagulpore in a case of execution of decree in which Government was decree-holder, and Asman Sing and others judgment-debtors. A question of amount of mesne profits which Government should receive under its decree was at issue, and the Subordinate Judge's order, based on his own opinion of average value, was, on appeal to the High Court, reversed, the profits of the land being assessed according to the result of an amin's enquiry.

Fureedpore.
No. 384 of 1885.
Fahmeedunnessa Begum, and others, plaintiffs, appellants.
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, respondent.

14. In this case the Dearah Survey Deputy Collector on the 3rd February 1879, directed that a quantity of land measuring about 1,160 bighas should be resumed as new accretions. Thereupon the plaintiffs instituted this suit against Government, claiming the said lands as reformations in site of their mouzah chur Mohun Sooreshur permanently settled with them. They stated that at the permanent settlement their mouzah was measured and found to contain about 10,042 bighas of land. That ever since that time they paid the Government revenue then assessed without any abatement, and that the lands in suit were identical with those permanently settled with them.

The Government in their answer objected to the jurisdiction of the civil court to entertain the present suit, the lands in suit being liable to assessment under the provisions of Act IX of 1847.

The Subordinate Judge of Fureedpore on the 28th March 1883 decreed the plaintiffs' suit. In appeal Mr. Beveridge, the District Judge of Fureedpore, on the 28th November 1884 decreed the appeal, and dismissed the plaintiffs' suit, holding that the civil court had no jurisdiction to entertain the suit. On second appeal to the High Court, Messrs. Field and Macpherson, J.J., referred the two following questions to the Full Bench :—

1*st.*—Whether the provisions of Act IX of 1847 are applicable to land reformed on the site of a permanently-settled estate, and the revenue of which estate has been paid without abatement since the permanent settlement.

2*ndly.*—Whether if these provisions are not so applicable, a civil court should, in the exercise of its discretion, make a decree declaring that the proceedings of the Revenue authorities in respect of such land are *ultra vires.* The Full Bench, by a majority of four against one, held that the civil courts had jurisdiction to entertain the suit, and that the provisions of Act IX of 1847 were not applicable to lands reformed on the site of an estate. On the merits, the High Court agreed with the Subordinate Judge that, the lands in suit were reformations in site of plaintiff's estate, chur Mohun Sooreshur, and accordingly affirmed the Subordinate Judge's decree in favour of the plaintiffs. The question whether the land is liable to assessment or already covered by an existing settlement, appears to have been always reserved for the decision of the Revenue authorities, and section 6 of Act IX of 1847, declares the Board's decision final in such case. This judgment of the Full Bench ignoring this principle, overruling previous decisions of the High Court itself, has been appealed to Her Majesty in Council.

Cuttack.
Miscellaneous appeal No. 460 of 1887.
Rani Surya Moni Patmahadi, Rani of Pooree, and others,
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council.

15. This was an appeal to set aside an order of the Judge of Cuttack, appointing a receiver for the Temple of Jaggannath at Pooree. This order was premature, and was set aside.

16. The result of Government litigation in the lower appellate courts during the last year, as compared with that of the two preceding years, is as follows :—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government	...	111	29	25
Ditto against Government	...	8	17	7
Compromised, remanded, or withdrawn	...	8	...	17
Percentage in favour of Government	...	93	63	78

17. The percentage of cases decided in favour of Government in the lower Appellate Courts is, as it appears from the above figures, better than that of the previous year, but not up to the results of the year 1884-85.

18. The history of the cases decided against Government is given below.

Jessore.

Bepin Behary Roy, defendant, appellant,

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council, plaintiff, respondent.

Drobomoyee Gupta, defendant, appellant,

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council, plaintiff, respondent.

19. The facts of these cases have been fully given in paragraph 7 foregoing. The Government instituted four suits which were decreed by the first court, and against that judgment two of the defendants appealed to the High Court and the others appealed to the District Judge, who followed the judgment of the High Court and decreed the appeals

24-Pergunnahs.

Issur Chunder Ghose, plaintiff, appellant,

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, respondent.

20. The plaintiff brought this suit for the cancellation of a certificate against him made under the provisions of Act VII of 1880 (B.C.), and for refund of the amount recovered from him, together with costs incurred by him in the certificate proceedings. He said that the land for the rent of which the certificate was issued belonged to his holding in Punchannogram, and was never a portion of the canal surplus lands, and therefore no certificate should have been issued. Our contention was that the plaintiff was a tenant under the farmer, who held the disputed land together with other lands. That upon the expiry of the farming lease a *ryotwaree* settlement was made and in the *jummabundee* published, the plaintiff was mentioned as a tenant in respect of the disputed land, and he had made no objection to the assessment. The Munsiff of Sealdah dismissed the suit, but on appeal the District Judge held that the certificate issued in the present case under section 7 of Act VII of 1880 (B.C.) could only have been issued by the Collector of the district. He says:—"The Act draws a distinction between a Collector and a Collector of the district, the former can make a certificate provided for in section 5, but not under section 7 of the Act." He accordingly reversed the Munsiff's judgment and decreed the appeal. The case was sent up for a second appeal; but as I found that under the express provision of the Act (requiring a certificate under section 7 to be made by the Collector of the district), there was no chance of success in the High Court, no appeal was filed.

Backergunge.

Rakhal Chunder Roy and others, plaintiffs, appellants,

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, respondent.

21. This is also a suit for cancelment of a certificate under Act VII (B.C.) of 1880, and for refund of money paid by the plaintiffs under protest with costs and interest The first court dismissed the case on the plea of limitation, as the case was not instituted within one year, and the District Judge also dismissed the appeal on that ground; but on appeal to the High Court (Messrs. Prinsep and Trevelyan, J.J.) set aside the plea in bar, holding that the service of notice under section 10 of the Act was not sufficient, as no attempt was made to effect personal service, and accordingly remanded the case to the lower appellate court for trial on merits. On remand the lower Appellate Court decreed the appeal on the weight of evidence adduced by the plaintiffs and reversed the judgment of the first court. Against this judgment no second appeal was filed.

Dacca.

The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, appellant,

versus

Indro Mohun Soor, plaintiff, respondent.

22. This case has been briefly reported as decided against Government by the court of first instance in paragraph 38 of my report for 1884-85. The particulars of the case are these:—

The plaintiff says that the land in dispute is *lakhraj*; that it was held by Fakir Chand and Dasharath Karmoker as *mirash* land on a permanent rent of Re. 1-2 from one Mohesh Chunder Audhicary; that the said Fakir Chand and Dasharath sold their rights in the land to the plaintiff in 1868, and since then he had been in undisturbed possession of the land on payment of the permanently fixed rent to Mohesh Chunder Audhicary. That the Collector of Dacca alleging the disputed land to appertain to Government estate Faridabad made a certificate under Act

VII (B.C.) of 1880, and the plaintiff was obliged to pay in Rs. 2 to Government, that he objected to the issue of the certificate, but his petition was rejected. He appealed to the Commissioner, but his appeal was dismissed on the ground that the plaintiff being *locum tenens* of his predecessor Fakir Chand, who was a tenant having *mirash* right in the Government estate, was liable for the rent, and that the certificate was properly served on him.

We contended that mehal Faridabad was purchased by Government in the year 1863; that it was measured in the year 1868, and notices were issued under Act IX of 1825, but all objections preferred were disallowed; that Fakir Chand, the holder of the disputed land, did not make any objection whatever at the time; that it was then settled for 20 years from April 1868 to March 1888, at Rs. 304 with the plaintiff's father Ram Lochun Sur, who annually paid the whole revenue without demur till March 1880, including that of the disputed land which has been consecutively numbered 302 in the amin's chitta and map. The mehal was then brought under khas management since 1880, when it was found that the land in dispute was in the possession of the plaintiff, and we were therefore entitled to realize rent from him.

The Munsiff declared that the plaintiff was liable to pay rent of the *mirash* to Government and not to Mohesh Chunder Audhicary, and accordingly decreed the suit.

Against this decision an appeal was filed by the local authorities without reference to this office, on the ground that, as the plaintiff totally denied the right and title of Government in the land in dispute, his suit should have been dismissed with costs; that the plaintiff having signally failed to prove his *mirash*, the lower court was wrong to find the *mirash* right of the plaintiff in the land in dispute, &c., &c., &c.

The Subordinate Judge of Dacca dismissed our appeal, on the ground that in the judgment of the Commissioner in the certificate case, "it has been remarked that the disputed land was the *mirash* holding of Fakir Chand Kurmoker, who transferred the holding to one Hari Mohun Dass, from whom the plaintiff purchased the same, and that the plaintiff has also by other evidence satisfactorily proved his *mirash* right in the land in dispute."

Against this judgment no second appeal was filed in the High Court, as the interest in dispute appeared to me too trivial to warrant the expense it would entail.

23. In these cases the Subordinate Judge of Sarun gave modified decrees in favour of the plaintiffs as will be found reported in paragraph 48 of this office report for 1885-86. Against that judgment we filed appeals on the ground that, the whole of the plaintiffs' claim was barred by limitation. That as regards the portion decreed, the lower court was wrong in throwing the onus on Government, and that the finding of the court below was against the weight of evidence The District Judge, however, held that the plaintiffs' possession was satisfactorily proved, and that the finding of the lower court was not contrary to the evidence. He accordingly dismissed our appeals.

Sarun.

The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, appellant,

versus

Baboo Deo Coomar Sing and others, paintiffs respondents

The Secretary of State for India in Council, defendant, appellants,

versus

Mussamut Tukmani Koer and others, plaintiffs, respondents.

24. The following is the result of Government litigation in the courts of first instance during 1886-87, as compared with that of the two previous years:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government	...	313	519	687
Decided against Government	...	139	71	83
Compromised, or withdrawn	.	90	35	123
Percentage in favour of Government	...	69	88	89

25. The result of cases decided in the court of first instance is better than that of the two preceding years. The increase in the number of cases decided during the year is owing to a large number of land acquisition cases in the districts of 24-Pergunnahs, Patna, and Dacca.

26. Out of the 83 cases shown as decided against Government, five cases from the districts noted in the margin, do not appear to have been reported to this office. Of the remaining 78 cases, 21 are cases under the Land Acquisition Act, in which the Judge awarded a larger amount of compensation to the claimants than that offered by the Collectors. There remains then 56 cases, out of which 35 cases were brought by the tenants of village Bokalia in the district of Chittagong for reduction of jumma assessed on them under Act VIII (B.C.) of 1879 on the ground that the rate fixed by the Settlement Deputy Collector was above the rate prevailing in the pergunnah, and also higher than that paid by them previously. They also urged that their rent having once been enhanced by the Settlement Officer, Mr. Fasson, could not be again enhanced within 10 years. We denied plaintiffs' occupancy rights or their having made any improvements in their lands, and asserted that the recent measurement proved that their holdings included more lands than alleged by them. That the rate fixed was neither higher than the neighbouring rate, nor higher than that previously paid by them. That the assessment made by Mr. Fasson was not confirmed by any competent authority, and was therefore not binding. The Munsiff of Chittagong, however, found on evidence that the plaintiffs have occupancy rights which has been indirectly admitted by Government by the assessment of their lands under section 6 of Act VIII of 1879. That although the measurement by Mr. Fasson was not approved by the Commissioner, his assessment was confirmed by the Board; consequently the rate fixed by him must hold good for 10 years. He accordingly decreed the suits in favour of the plaintiffs. In all these cases appeals have been filed in the District Judge's Court, where they are still pending.

Burdwan.

1. Bidhu Mukhi Dasi, *versus* Government.
2. Protap Majhi, *versus* Government.

Midnapore.

3. Ajudhyaram Pytal, *versus* Government.

Dacca.

4. Hossein Khan, *versus* Government.

Patna.

5. Juggernath Sing, *versus* Government.

27. I give below the particulars of some of the remaining 21 cases decided against Government in the courts of first instance.

28. This was a suit for possession of 14½ cottahs of land, together with value of trees, &c., standing thereon which the plaintiffs claimed as part and parcel of their property. The Chairman of the Road Cess Committee claimed the land as a part of the Barripore road. The Munsiff, however, found that the land in dispute appertained to plaintiffs' property, and accordingly decreed the suit with costs and *wasilut*. Against this judgment an appeal has been filed. which is still pending.

24-Perounnahs.

Surendra Nath Ghose and others,

versus

The Chairman of the Road Cess Committee of 24-Pergunnahs.

29. The plaintiffs in these suits claimed their right-of-way through the Burrisal school premises. We defended the suits on the ground of the plaintiffs having no right-of-way through the school compound, and also pleaded limitation. The Munsiff of Burrisal decreed the suits in favour of the plaintiffs, and we have filed appeals against his order.

Backergunge.

1. Radhika Mohun Bundopadhya,

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council.

2. Beharylal Roy Chowdhry

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council.

30. The plaintiff brought this suit to recover Rs. 3,443 as the amount due to him on account of work done by him under contract in the railway stations at Mymensing and Guffergaon. We pleaded that the plaintiff has already been overpaid, and that nothing was due to him for work done under contract. The Subordinate Judge of Mymensing gave a partial decree. Against this judgment, an appeal has been filed in the Court of the District Judge of Mymensing, where the case is still pending.

Mymensing.

Mahomed Hossein Bepari,

versus

The Secretary of State for India in Council.

31. The plaintiffs brought this suit for a declaratory decree establishing their proprietory right to a part of the public road adjoining their building at Kamarputty, in the town of Nusirabad, over which they had made brick verandah, and to restrain the municipality from interfering with it as an encroachment on the public road. Our contention was that the

Mymensing.

Bamasundari Dasi and another

versus

The Chairman of the Nusirabad Municipality.

plaintiffs had no cause of action, that there was no ground for a declaratory decree, and that the masonry addition made by the plaintiff was on the municipal road. The Court found that the plaintiffs made no encroachment on the public road; that the land and the drain on which the masonry additions were made belonged to the plaintiffs, and accordingly decreed the suit. Against this decision an appeal has been filed.

Chittagong.
Chundra Kant Pal,
versus
1. The Secretary of State for India in Council.
2. Shamud Ali

32. The plaintiff brought this suit to recover Rs. 57 being part of sale proceeds of a *noabad* taluk, on the ground that although the money had been attached by the civil court at the instance of the plaintiff, the Collector paid away the money to defendant No. 2. We pleaded limitation under Article 62, schedule II, Act XV of 1877, and also urged that Government was not responsible for any mistake of the Collector. The Munsiff decided the question of limitation in favour of the plaintiff, and decreed the suit against defendant No. 2, who had drawn the money.

Abdul Ali
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council.

33. In this case plaintiff sued to cancel the chitta made by the settlement amin, wherein a certain piece of land was wrongly recorded as *noabad*, whereas the same really belonged to plaintiff's *lakhraj* taluk. We denied the plaintiff's allegation and claimed the land as *noabad*. The Munsiff found from the civil court amin's report that a part of the land in question was covered by the plaintiff's taluk, and accordingly decreed the suit. Against the decision an appeal has been filed.

The Secretary of State for India in Council
versus
Ramdhun Dhur and others.

34. The facts of this case are:—That 11-anna-9-pie share of an estate named Mahomed Tuckee was pledged as security by Noabjan under a deed of security bond, dated 16th June 1881, for payment of rent of a certain *ijara* obtained by one Misser Jan under Government. That the said Noabjan in collusion with Ramdhun Dhur sold her interest by a deed of private sale to Ramdhun Dhur, although the deed of sale was nominally drawn in the name of one Koilas Chunder, a servant of Ramdhun Dhur. This estate having been ultimately put up to sale for its own arrears was purchased by the aforesaid Ramdhun Dhur. Hence this suit was brought for establishment of lien under the security bond. The court found that the security bond was executed on the 16th June 1881, and the first settlement between Misser Jan and Government was made on the 22nd June 1881, on an annual rental of Rs. 2,747. On the 28th July 1881, Misser Jan's *taluki jama* was raised to Rs. 2,856. Again a fresh settlement was made with Misser Jan on the 27th June 1882, at an annual rental of Rs. 2,673. There being no proof that Noabjan gave her consent to these variations, the court held that the surety had been discharged under section 133 of Act IX of 1872, and accordingly dismissed the suit.

Jakir Ali Chowdhry
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council, and others.

35. This is a suit to set aside a revenue sale, on the ground that the sale notices were suppressed by plaintiff's co-sharer who has been made defendant No. 2, in this case. We pleaded that the sale notices were duly published, and that we were not aware of any fraud having been practised by defendant No. 2. The court found that there was no clear evidence to show that the sale notice was duly fixed in the Judge's Court. The roobocaree addressed by the Collector to the Judge asking him to affix the notice in his office had no mention of any taluk either by name or number. The real value of the property as proved by evidence was upwards of Rs. 1,000, whereas the price fetched at the sale was Rs. 15 only. The Subordinate Judge therefore ordered the sale to be set aside and made each party bear his own cost.

Shibdoolary Towary and another
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council.

36. The plaintiffs brought this suit to establish their right to and for confirmation of possession in certain land situated within their zemindary, pergunnah Sundip, chakla Bamni and Hatia, which has been seized by the Revenue authorities as lying beyond the outer line of the plaintiffs' zemindary as measured during the last revenue survey.

We pleaded limitation and urged that the land in dispute was a new formation in the bed of a large navigable river, and was beyond the outer line of thak and survey of 1864-65; and therefore the plaintiffs had no right to hold free of assessment. The court found that the land in dispute had been in existence during the measurement by Captain Hodges in 1836, and was found to be within the outer line of the said measurement, and therefore decreed the suit.

The Maharajah of Durbhunga,
versus
The Chairman of the Durbhunga Municipality.

37. The Maharajah in this suit sued for possession of certain land acquired by Government for the Durbhunga Municipality, on the ground that no compensation was paid to him, and that a market established on the land which had been acquired for a ghat, &c. It was contended on behalf of the Chairman of the Municipality that the land in dispute was validly acquired by Government; that the manager of the Court of Wards for the time being, by order of the Board of Revenue, gave up his right to compensation; and, that the market was established with the plaintiff's acquiescence. The District Judge of Mozufferpore found that the land was not properly acquired; that the manager under the Court of Wards of a minor proprietor could not waive his right to compensation for land, &c., and accordingly decreed the suit. Against this judgment an appeal has been filed in the High Court.

Shahabad.
Syed Mehdi Hossein,
versus
The Secretary of State and others.

38. The plaintiff brought this suit for possession by declaring his right over a piece of land in the Government estate in Arrah, which he purchased from the vendee of Pheroo Kasab with whom a settlement had been made by Government in 1275F, and also claimed mesne profits.

Our contention was that the land in suit was settled with Pheroo Kasab as an ordinary ryot, who was ejected therefrom in 1875 for breaking the conditions of his lease, and that the said Pheroo Kasab had no right of occupancy, nor any transferable right whatsoever in the land in question. The Munsiff of Arrah, however, decreed the suit, and ordered mesne profits to be realized from the defendants other than Government. No appeal has yet been filed, but will be filed shortly, as the Collector says that the judgment of the Munsiff is a remarkable one, and if not upset on appeal, will form a most inconvenient precedent.

Sarun.
Sadhu Sarun Singh and another
versus
The Secretary of State for Indian in Council and others.

39. This is a case to set aside the sale for arrears of road cess on the ground of irregularity and illegality in the service of sale notices. The case was originally dismissed on the ground of limitation in June 1884, against which an appeal was filed in the High Court, but the High Court on the 30th April 1886 set aside the plea of limitation, and remanded the case for determination of the issue, as to whether the sale actually took place within 30 days from the date when the proclamation was stuck up in the Collectorate. On remand the Subordinate Judge of Sarun took fresh evidence from both the parties, and found that the sale did take place within 30 days from the date when the proclamation was stuck up in the Collectorate. He accordingly set aside the sale, and decreed the suit in favour of the plaintiffs with all costs payable by Government.

Bhagulpore.
The Secretary of State for India in Council
versus
Gurbux Sahu.

40. This suit was brought to eject the defendant, who is a tenant in mouza Binda dearah, from 386 bighas of land after notice to quit, on the ground that he had no right of occupancy in the land. The defendant contended that he had acquired right of occupancy, and further that the notice which was served on him determining the relationship of landlord and tenant was waived by taking rent from him subsequent to the service of the notice. The Subordinate Judge found on evidence that the notice was not properly served, and that rent was received after the expiry of the period mentioned in the notice. He accordingly dismissed the suit. Against this decision an appeal has been filed.

Purneah.
Amrit Nath Jha,
versus
The Secretary of State for India in Council and others.

41. The plaintiff brought this suit for reversal of sale of the revenue-paying estate mouzah Kadumbagachi, on the ground of irregularities, and specially of non-service of notice, under section 5 of Act XI of 1859. We pleaded that there were no irregularities either in the publication of notice or conduct of the sale, that no notice under section 424 of the Civil Procedure Code, having been served by the plaintiff the suit against Government could not proceed. That the plaint was insufficiently stamped, and that objection of non-service of notice under section 5 of Act XI of 1859 not having been taken by the plaintiff in his appeal to the Commissioner could not be heard by the Civil Court under section 33 of the Act. The court found that the notice under section 5 of the sale law was not issued and served. The sale was therefore irregular, and the price fetched was not fair and adequate. The sale was accordingly set aside.

42. The result of Wards' litigation in all the courts of Bengal during 1886-87, as compared with that of the two preceding years, is as follows:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Court of Wards	...	700	1,113	1,034
Decided against Court of Wards	...	121	158	310
Compromised, remanded, or withdrawn	.	56	44	91
Percentage in favour of Court of Wards	...	85¼	87½	77

43. This low percentage is due to 210 cases instituted by the Manager of the Dighaputia estate for recovery of arrears of rent having been decided against the Court of Wards during the year. The particulars of these will be given hereafter when dealing with the original suits of Court of Wards.

44. The following is the result of Wards' litigation in the High Court during 1886-87, as compared with that of the two preceding years:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Court of Wards	..	29	59	20
Decided against Court of Wards	...	3	4	3
Compromised, remanded or withdrawn	..	1	1	4
Percentage in favour of Court of Wards	..	90⅝	93¾	87

45. In all three cases decided against the minors, the Court of Wards have had nothing to do while they were before the lower courts, the estates then not being in the hands of the Court of Wards. Two out of the three cases are miscellaneous appeals, arising from execution proceedings, and are of no interest. The only case which came in regular appeal to the High Court is of a very complicated nature as to shares under the Mahomedan law. The substance of the case is this.

Appeal No. 28 *of* 1886.
Moharaj Kumari Radheshuri Kessori, defendant-appellant,
versus
Mussamut Nujeebunnissa Begum, plaintiff-respondent.

46. The Tikari Ranee after having advanced large sums on the security, finally purchased in execution certain villages. The plaintiff set up certain rights accruing under the Mahomedan law which, it was believed, had been abandoned under a family compromise very many years ago. The attempt succeeded in both courts owing to their refusal to admit as evidence the documents relied on by the Tikari Ranee to prove the compromise.

47. The result of Wards' litigation in the lower appellate courts during the year under report, as compared with the result of the two preceding years, is as follows:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Court of Wards	...	40	48	44
Decided against the Court of Wards ...	...	25	31	38
Compromised, remanded or withdrawn	...	9	7	4
Percentage in favour of Court of Wards	...	61½	60¾	53½

48. Of the 38 appeal cases decided against the Court of Wards, 29 were not reported to this office, being rent suits or suits of a Small Cause Court nature, and two cases were conducted without the sanction of this office. The

particulars of some of the remaining 7 appeal cases which are of any importance are given below.

Hooghly.
No. 2 of 1885.
Dighaputia minors, defendant-appellants,
Versus.
Nobin Mohun Singha, plaintiff-respondent.

49. This was a suit to establish as a charge on property purchased by the minors a family provision which its previous owner had created to support a relative of his wife. The suit was successful.

Tipperah.
Joadali and others, defendants-appellants,
versus
Ashutosh Nath Roy, minor under the Court of Wards, plaintiff-respondent.

50. The minor brought this suit for the establishment of his right to a *bheel*, and for damages. The Munsiff decreed the suit, but on appeal the Subordinate Judge held that the disputed *bheel* was not shown to be situated within the zemindary under which the plaintiff holds putni, and that the defandants have been catching fish in the *bheel* openly and with the consent of the plaintiff's tenants, and accordingly decreed the appeal. No second appeal was filed.

51. The following is the result of Wards' litigation in the courts of first instance during 1886-87, as compared with the results of the two preceding years:—

	1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Court of Wards	631	1,006	970
Decided against Court of Wards	93	123	269
Compromised or withdrawn	46	36	83
Percentage in favour of Court of Wards ...	87½	89	78

52. Out of the 269 cases decided against the Court of Wards, 259 cases were not reported to this office, as they were mostly rent suits or suits of a Small Cause Court nature. Of these 259 cases, 210 in the district of Pubna alone were instituted by the Manager of the Dighaputia estate for recovery of arrears of rent according to a settlement made by Mr. Rees, Collector of Pubna. The defendants were willing to pay according to the rate fixed by Mr. Taylor, and not according to that fixed by Mr. Rees; but the Munsiff, finding that the defendants were bound to pay the rent fixed by Mr. Taylor, dismissed the suits. Against this judgment appeals have been preferred, and they are still pending.

53. The remaining cases are of no special importance, and call for no detailed mention.

54. The following table shows the amount of Government decrees recovered during 1886-87, as compared with the amounts recovered during the two previous years:—

	1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Amount under realization .	6,42,647	6,26,182	50,449
Realized during the year ...	20,407	12,338	13,367
Percentage of recovery ..	3½	2	26½

55. The amount under realization would, from the figures as exhibited above, appear on comparison to be much less than that of the previous year; but it is not actually so. On referring to paragraph 67 of this office report of last year, it will be found that, putting aside the Canning decrees which were remitted during that year, the amount under realization was Rs. 44,903, whereas during the year under review the amount under realization is Rs. 50,449. The percentage of recovery is one per cent. less than that of the previous year.

56. The heaviest outstanding balances are in the following districts:—

Bankoora, Rs. 4,544.—Of this amount, Rs. 4,535 are due from one Ashootosh Ghose, who was reported as dead in last year's report, is now said by the Collector to be still a minor, and that steps will be taken on his attaining majority. The balance is being realized by intalments.

Midnapore, Rs. 3,060.—Out of this sum, Rs. 1,900 are said to be irrecoverable and fit to be remitted. The balance is under process of recovery.

Julpigoree, Rs. 4,455.—Of this sum, Rs. 4,247 have been decreed during the year, Rs. 4,004 thereof on the 23rd March 1887.

Backergunge, Rs. 1,488.—Of this amount, Rs. 126 have since been realized and deposited in court; Rs. 24 could not be realized, as the debtor had filed an appeal to the District Judge; Rs. 1,162 are due from Babu Kalikrisna Tagore, who appealed to the High Court, and the appeal has only recently been disposed of. The rest is under process of recovery.

Sarun, Rs. 7,154.—Out of this amount, Rs. 896 due in two cases should be struck out of the statement, as the cases have been decided against Government by the High Court on appeal. For five thousand rupees decreed during the year, execution has been taken out, and the balance was decreed at the end of the year.

57. Nothing was realized in the districts of Jessore, Rajshahye, Rungpore, and Sonthal Pergunnahs, the decrees having been obtained only at the latter end of the year, and in some cases appeals having been preferred which are still pending.

58. The following table shows the amount of Wards' decrees recovered during 1886-87 as compared with the realizations of the two preceding years:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Amount under realization	...	5,72,757	9,37,524	11,07,570
Realized during the year	...	1,02,253	1,69,179	1,63,806
Percentage of recovery	...	19$\frac{3}{5}$	18	14$\frac{7}{9}$

59. The increase of the demand is due to a large number of decrees having been awarded during the year in favour of the following estates, viz.:—Burdwan Raj estate, Basudebpore estate, Maldwar estate, Dighaputea estate, Srinuggur estate, and Chota Nagpore estate.

60. All that I can say with regard to the low percentage of recovery is that a large part of the outstanding balance is bad and irrecoverable, consisting of rent decrees obtained long before the estates came under the Court of Wards which will have to be remitted sooner or later.

61. The following districts have the largest outstanding balances at the close of the year:—

		Hooghly.			Rs.
Sooltangacha estate	...	...	...	...	23,911
		Burdwan.			
Burdwan Raj estate	...	...	...	...	2,88,257
		Midnapore.			
Basudebpore estate	...	...	...	...	25,276
Khetterhat estate	...	...	...	...	17,034
		Jessore.			
Narail estate	...	...	...	...	22,801
		Moorshedabad.			
Cossimbazar estate	...	...	...	...	13,139
		Dinagepore.			
Maldwar estate	...	...	...	...	22,233
		Rajshahye.			
Dighaputtea estate	...	...	...	...	2,77,794
		Durbhunga.			
Nurhan estate	...	...	...	...	41,530
		Purneah.			
Srinagore estate	...	...	...	...	80,063
		Lohardugga.			
Chota Nagpore estate	...	...	...	...	44,939

62. As in last year, there has been no realization this year also in the district of Tipperah on account of the estate of Syud Basharat Ali Chowdry, lunatic. It is said that the balance of Rs. 5,487 is due from two persons: from one the amount could not be recovered as the debtor has no property, and as for the other, enquiries are being made about his assets.

63. I was in charge of this office during the whole year.

64. The following changes occurred in the office of district Government Pleaders during the year under review:—

There was no permanent vacancy in the office of Government Pleaders, but Baboo Mohini Mohan Burdhan, the Government Pleader of Tipperah, having obtained leave of absence for two years to join his appointment as Minister of the Rajah of Hill Tipperah, I have appointed Baboo Shib Chander Aich to officiate for him during the Government Pleader's absence.

65. In deference to the direction contained in paragraph 12 of Government resolution on this office report of last year, I submit the names of the following as in my opinion the most capable Government Pleaders; but this opinion must be understood as based rather on my general knowledge of the men than on work actually passing into my office during the year. The great mass of civil work is now-a-days carried on in outlying munsiffs' courts, where the district Government Pleader does not practice, and the preliminary papers submitted to this office are for the most part prepared in the Collector's or Court of Wards' sheristas, and furnish but scanty materials by which to judge a pleader's efficiency. It is further to be borne in mind that Government Pleaders are not Government servants in the ordinary sense, the greater part of their income being received not from Government, but private suitors, and there are obvious objections to publishing in a report remarks that may unjustly affect their position with such suitors. I have had no reason to complain of the diligence or efficiency of any of the district pleaders during the year under review; but the most efficient are Sattya Kinkur Sen of Burdwan, Eshan Chander Mitra of Hooghly, Ashootosh Mukerjee of 24-Pergunnahs, and Khoda Bux of Patna.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

T. T. ALLEN,

Supdt. and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

A.

Cases instituted to establish some substantial right.

	Total.	Decisions.						Pending.	
		Favourable.		Unfavourable.		Withdrawn, compromised, or remanded.			
	No.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.
(2) Suits to establish a title to hold land rent-free or at a fixed assessment.									
High Court	3	1	25	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	600
Zillah appeals	37	2	1,325	.....	...	.....	.....	35	1,052
Original suits	60	8	695	35	913	.....	.....	17	74,669
Total	100	11	2,045	35	913	.....	.....	54	76,321
(3) Suits for land arising out of settlement proceedings.									
High Court	1	1	130	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	3	1	1,725	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	325
Original suits	3	2	300	1	25	...	...	.....	.....
Total ..	7	4	2,155	1	25	.....	.....	2	325
(4) Suits to establish a title to engage for lands under settlement.									
High Court	3	1	18,156	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	822
Zillah appeals	3	2	350	.....	.....	1	10	.....	...
Original suits	3	2	5,081	... ..	... ..	.....	.....	1	500
Total ...	9	5	23,587	... ..	.....	1	10	3	1,322
(5) Suits to establish a title to vacant possession and properties claimed by or escheated to Government.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	... ..	.....	.....	.....	..
Zillah appeals	2	... ..		.....	..	.....	.. ...	2	2,075
Original suits	7	1	28,524	4	2,235	.....	.....	2	396
Total ..	9	1	28,524	4	2,235	.....	.....	4	2,471
(6) Suits for reinstatement in office from which claimants have been dismissed by local agents or other authorities.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.. ..	.....	..
Original suits	1	. ..	... ..	.....	... ..	.. ...	.....	1	1,500
Total ...	1	... ..	.....	.....	... ..	....	....	1	1,500
(7) Suits for recovery of salaries, malikana, pensions, fees, &c., &c.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	3	1	5,485	.....	...	.....	.	2	3,465
Original suits	5	3	6,148	1	3,443	1	132	.	
Total ...	8	4	11,633	1	3,443	1	132	2	3,465
(8) Suits for recovery of sums unjustly realised, or for the recovery of rents unduly levied, or for the recovery of receipts of rent or for exoneration from unjust demands.									
High Court'...	1	.....	..	.....	.....	.. ...	.....	1	46
Zillah appeals	8	5	1,688	2	567	.. ...	.....	1	215
Original suits	21	9	2,787	2	556	1	29	9	556
Total .	30	14	4,475	4	1,123	1	29	11	817
(9) Suits for wasilut, or for the recovery of costs, or surplus collections after an adjustment of account, or value of property or purchase money.									
High Court	3	3	.....	... ..	.....	...	.. ...	.. ...	... .
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.. ..	.....	... .	.. .	...	.. ..	. .
Original suits	20	6	8,734	4	913	2	525	8	5,866
Total ...	23	9	8,734	4	913	2	525	8	5,866
(10) Suits to obtain possession of land, estates or other property, for the recovery of rents or bond debts.									
High Court	16	8	14,876	3	4,11,281	1	1,148	4	2,57,385
Zillah appeals	33	8	6,913	3	1,455	15	803	7	3,123
Original suits	63	15	18,425	7	7,528	5	7,735	36	52,396
Total ...	112	31	40,234	13	5,264	21	9,186	47	3,12,903
(11) Suits in which Government is made a defendant *pro formâ*.									
High Court	1	. ..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	150
Zillah appeals	...	....	... ..	...	.....	.....	.....	... .	.
Original suits	4	2	312	1	639	.. . .	... ..	1	1,529
Total ...	5	2	312	1	639		.... .	2	1,679
(12) Probate cases.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	....	.....	.....	.....	.	.....
Zillah appeals	. ..	.....	... ..	.....	. . ..	.....	.....	...	. .
Original suits	1	1	..	.	..	.....	.....	... .	
Total ...	1	1	.....	... ..	... ..	.....	... ..	...	.....

B.

Cases instituted to obtain redress from official acts.

	Total.		Decisions.						Pending.
			Favourable.		Unfavourable.		Withdrawn, compromised, or remanded.		
	No.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.
(2) Suits for the reversal of revenue sales on the plea of informality, non-liability, &c.									
High Court	11	4	11,610	2	5,837	1	1,200	4	1,19,587
Zillah appeals	8	4	4,510	.....	...	1	48	3	1,042
Original suits	30	17	1,77,047	3	15,500	.....	.....	10	70,466
Total ...	49	25	1,93,167	5	21,337	2	1,248	17	1,91,095
(3) Suits for the reversal of sales in execution of decrees on the plea of informality, non-liability, &c.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	3	1	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	1,680
Total ...	3	1	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	1,680
(4) Suits for the reversal of sales of property pledged as security on the plea that the property sold was not liable, or on other pleas.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(5) Suits to stay revenue sales in execution of decrees or sales of property pledged as security.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(6) Suits of third parties advancing claims to land or moveable property attached or sold by Government as belonging to others.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	5,572
Original suits	20	13	8,853	1	89	.....	.....	6	1,389
Total ...	23	13	8,853	1	89	.....	.....	9	6,961
(7) Suits improperly instituted against officers in their official capacity over which the Civil Court has no jurisdiction.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(8) Suits to contest order reversing sales, or regarding confirmation, or quashing of butwarrahs, or the imposition of fines.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(9) Suits for damages on account of acts done by revenue or other officers.									
High Court	1	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	4	1	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	352
Original suits	14	6	3,560	1	273	1	150	6	4,244
Total ...	19	7	5,560	2	273	1	150	9	4,596

C.

Cases in which Government is Plaintiff.

	Total.	Decisions.						Pending.	
		Favourable.		Unfavourable.		Compromised, remanded or withdrawn.			
	No.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.	No.	Value. Rs.
(2) Suits to establish a title to assess or levy enhanced assessment.									
High Court	66	.....	.....	66	2,086	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	66	.....	.....	66	2,086	.....	.....	.....	.....
(3) Suits for the recovery of sums misappropriated from defaulters or their sureties.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(4) Suits for refund of money paid to parties not entitled to it.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(5) Suits for the recovery of sums from parties or their sureties for nonfulfilment of contract.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	15	12	5,401	1	6,289	.....	.....	2	842
Total ...	15	12	5,401	1	6,289	.....	.....	2	842
(6) Suits for possession of land, or for recovery of debt, or for damages.									
High Court	10	3	1,04,810	5	1,25,993	.....	.....	2	67,500
Zillah appeals	4	1	277	2	2,638	.....	.....	1	1,939
Original suits	21	11	1,103	1	1,930	1	845	8	50,856
Total ...	35	15	1,06,190	8	1,30,561	1	845	11	1,20,295
(7) Suits to impose fines for the infraction of salt laws.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(8) Land Acquisition cases under Act X of 1870.									
High Court	17	9	2,640	.....	.....	.....	.....	8	64,717
Zillah appeals	6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6	8,481
Original suits	900	578	2,69,436	21	17,977	112	80,096	189	1,60,524
Total ...	923	587	2,72,076	21	17,977	112	80,096	203	2,33,722
(9) Interpleader suits under section 470, Act XIV of 1882.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(10) Cases under section 537 of the Civil Procedure Code.									
High Court	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zillah appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Original suits	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	51,82,282
Total .	1	..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	51,82,282

D.

General Abstract Statement of Suits in the Civil Courts of Bengal, in which Government is a party, disposed of and pending in the year 1886-87.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
				ORIGINAL SUITS.						APPEAL SUITS.											
				DECIDED WITHIN THE YEAR.									DECIDED WITHIN THE YEAR.								
				In favour of Government.	Against Government.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						In favour of Government.	Against Government.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Remanded.				
Names of Districts.	Number of suits pending on the 31st March 1886.	Number of suits instituted from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.	Total.	Cases in which Government is plaintiff. / Cases in which Government is defendant.	Cases in which Government is plaintiff. / Cases in which Government is defendant.	Cases in which Government is plaintiff. / Cases in which Government is defendant.	Cases in which Government is plaintiff. / Cases in which Government is defendant.	Total decided.	Pending on 31st March 1887.	Number of suits pending on the 31st March 1886.	Number of suits instituted from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.	Total.	Cases in which Government is appellant. / Cases in which Government is respondent.	Cases in which Government is appellant. / Cases in which Government is respondent.	Cases in which Government is appellant. / Cases in which Government is respondent.	Cases in which Government is appellant. / Cases in which Government is respondent.	Cases in which Government is appellant. / Cases in which Government is respondent.	Total decided.	Pending on 31st March 1887.	Number of cases in which Government is cost-winner.	Remarks.
High Court ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	105	28	133	4	26	3	74	...	...	...	...	2	109	24	3	
Bankoora ...	...*	3	3	...	...	...	...	...	3	3†	...	3	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	
Beerbhoom ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Burdwan ...	...	4	4	...	...	3	...	3	1	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	
Hooghly ...	2	2	4	1	3	...	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Midnapore ...	9	16	25	...	13	3	...	17	8	1	4	5	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3	...	
Jessore ...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	1	...	2	...	2	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	
Khoolna ...	21	7	28	26	1	...	...	27	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Moorshedabad ...	2	3	5	...	3	...	...	3	2	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	
Nuddea ...	1	3	4	...	2	...	...	2	2	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	
24-Pergunnahs ...	73	599	672	461	1	11	3	45	2	24	1	548	124	1	2	3	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	2	...
Bogra ...	1	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dinagepore ...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Pubna ...	...	8	8	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	6	...	4	4	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	...
Rajshahye ...	3	2	5	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	3	2	15	1	16	...	...	...	...	...	15	...	...	15	1	...
Rungpore ...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Darjeeling ...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Julpigoree ...	...	4	4	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Backergunge ...	2	6	8	...	2	...	2	...	...	...	...	4	4	1	1	2	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...
Dacca ...	20	56	76	18	6	7	1	...	...	...	...	32	44	4	6	10	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	8	1
Furreedpore ...	3	...	3	...	2	...	...	...	1	...	...	3	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	
Mymensingh ...	4	3	7	...	1	...	2	...	...	...	...	3	4	...	3	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	
Chittagong ...	52	31	83	6	25	1	38	...	...	...	...	70	13	2	44	46	1	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	6	40	...
Noakholly ...	3	3	6	...	3	...	1	...	1	...	...	5	1	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Tipperah ...	1	5	6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chumparun ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Durbhanga ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gya ...	1	1	2	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mozufferpore ...	3	7	10	...	4	...	1	1	...	...	...	6	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sarun ...	7	4	11	...	8	...	1	...	...	...	...	9	2	4	1	5	2	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	5	...	2
Shahabad ...	1	11	12	1	2	...	2	...	1		...	6	6	...	2	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...
Patna ...	26	154	180	82	2	3	1	...	...	43	...	131	49	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bhagulpore ...	1	1	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	2	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...
Maldah ...	1	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Monghyr ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Purneah ...	...	1	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Balasore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cuttack ...	...	3	3	...	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	3	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Pooree ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hazaribagh ...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lohardugga ...	10	...	10	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	9	...	3	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...
Manbhoom ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Singbhoom ...	...	3	3	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	248	944	1,192	621	86	23	60	46	8	67	2	893	299	140	107	247	9	46	6	78	...	15	...	...	...	4	158	89	6

* There were two cases pending at the close of last year, but as Government did not appear they have been left out of the statement.
† There were 5 appeals pending at the close of last year, in two of which Government did not appear therefore they have been left out of the statement.

E.

Statement showing the amount expended in litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by Government under decrees of Court in the Revenue Department from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.

Divisions.	Districts.	Nature of Receipts.				Nature of Disbursements.				
		Decrees in civil Suits.	Decrees in Privy Council appeals.	Decrees in miscellaneous cases.	Total.	Amount including costs awarded against Government in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits.	In defence of suits.	Miscellaneous expenses.	Total.
Burdwan	Burdwan ...	156	.....	.....	156	.....	8	79	57	144
	Beerbhoom	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Bankoora	303	.....	.....	303	.....	4	.....	.....	4
	Midnapore	134	.....	.....	134	301	.....	2,140	395	2,836
	Hooghly ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	53	331	156	540
Presidency	24-Pergunnahs	407	.....	.....	407	447	251	170	849	1,717
	Nuddea	635	.....	.....	635	.....	.....	2	244	246
	Jessore	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	92	.....	730	822
	Khoolna	12	.....	.....	12	.....	.....	.....	24	24
	Moorshedabad	7	.....	.....	7	.....	1,000	831	153	1,984
	Soonderbuns	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rajshahye and Cooch Behar.	Rajshahye	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	671	671
	Bogra	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Rungpore	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Dinagepore	18	.....	.....	18	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Pubna	1,783	.....	.....	1,783	.....	42	642	17	701
	Julpigoree	46	.....	.....	46	7	620	.....	2	629
	Darjeeling	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Dacca	Dacca ...	180	.....	.....	180	1,096	91	231	37	1,455
	Mymensingh	106	.....	.....	106	.....	.....	849	1,175	2,024
	Furreedpore	3,178	.....	.....	3,178	.....	.....	463	.....	463
	Backergunge	22	.....	.....	22	581	.....	353	740	1,674
Patna	Patna ...	913	.....	.....	913	.....	851	1,281	946	3,078
	Mozufferpore	56	.....	.....	56	.....	27	4	.....	31
	Gya ...	135	.....	.....	135	282	12	.....	18	312
	Durbhunga	298	.....	.....	298	5,873	102	78	7,878	13,931
	Shahabad	27	.....	.....	27	641	.....	43	50	734
	Sarun ...	31	.....	.....	31	.....	.....	5	4,089	4,094
	Chumparua	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Bhagulpore	Bhagulpore	.....	.....	16	16	.....	.....	.....	79	79
	Monghyr	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	2,804	2,954
	Maldah ...	3,846	.....	.....	3,846	814	36	39	204	1,083
	Purneah ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Dumka ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	769	.....	769
Chota Nagpore.	Lohurdugga	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Manbhoom	25	.....	.....	25	.....	3	42	135	180
	Singbhoom	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	.....	350
	Hazaribagh	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Orissa	Cuttack ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Balasore ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8	.....	.....	8
	Pooree ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	32	32
Chittagong	Chittagong	381	.....	.....	381	439	238	1,458	192	2,327
	Noakhally	504	.....	.....	504	341	.....	661	.....	1,002
	Tippersh ...	148	.....	.....	148	.....	1,522	17	131	1,470
	Total ...	13,351	.....	16	13,367	10,822	4,900	10,838	21,808	48,368

F.

Statement showing the amount expended in litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by Government under decrees of Court in the Salt and Opium Departments from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.

(Blank).

G.

General abstract statement showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of Government in the Revenue Department was realised and what was outstanding on 1st April 1887.

Divisions.	Districts.	Outstanding on the 1st April 1886.			Awarded in favour of Government from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.			Total.			Realised during 1886-87.			Balance.			Remitted by competent authority.			Net balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Burdwan	Burdwan	240	.....	.....	6	.....	.....	246	.....	.....	156	.....	.....	90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	90	.....	...
	Beerbhoom	485	16	15	.....	.....	.....	485	16	15	.....	.....	.....	485	16	15	.....	.....	.....	485	16	15
	Bankurah	4,048	477	60	6	233	23	4,054	710	83	258	17	28	3,796	693	55	.....	.....	.....	3,796	693	55
	Midnapore	1,290	789	375	748	1	41	2,038	790	366	92	1	41	1,946	789	325	.....	.....	.....	1,946	789	325
	Hooghly	133	2	1	243	.....	3	376	2	4	.....	.....	.....	376	2	4	133	2	1	243	.....	3
Presidency	24-Pergunnahs	383	.....	34	625	.....	41	1,008	.....	75	356	.....	51	652	.....	24	72	.....	.....	580	.....	24
	Nuddea	.....	.....	6·2	.....	.....	49	.....	.....	681	.....	.....	635	.....	.....	46	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	46
	Jessore	.....	.....	.....	259	.....	.....	259	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	259	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	259	.....	...
	Khoolna	182	.....	28	116	.....	24	298	.....	52	12	.....	.....	286	.....	52	53	.....	11	233	.....	41
	Moorshedabad	259	.....	.....	7	.....	.....	266	.....	.....	7	.....	.....	259	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	259	.....	...
	Soonderbuns	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
Rajshahye and Cooch Behar	Rajshahye	464	.....	.....	381	10	8	845	10	8	.....	.....	.....	845	10	8	.....	.....	.....	845	10	8
	Bogra	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Rungpore	.....	.....	183	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	183	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	183	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	183
	Dinagepore	.....	.....	18	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	18	.....	.....	18	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	..
	Pubna	.....	205	790	.....	123	665	.....	328	1,455	.....	328	1,455	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Julpigoree	(a) 234	29	(a) 60	3,528	30	620	3,762	59	680	46	.....	.....	3,716	59	680	.....	.....	.....	3,716	59	680
	Darjeeling	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
Dacca	Dacca	189	.....	3	683	.....	14	872	.....	17	180	.....	.....	692	.....	17	83	.....	.....	609	.....	17
	Mymensingh	101	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	101	.....	5	101	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Furreedpore	3,509	2	4	15	18	107	3,524	20	111	3,053	18	107	471	2	4	.....	.....	.....	471	2	4
	Backergunge	568	88	2	745	45	62	1,313	133	64	22	.....	.....	1,291	133	64	.....	.....	.....	1,291	133	64
Patna	Patna	917	42	.....	101	25	13	1,018	67	13	835	65	13	183	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	183	2	...
	Mozufferpore	.....	.....	.....	32	3	21	32	3	21	32	3	21	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Gya	212	99	275	.....	32	.....	212	131	275	111	22	2	101	109	273	.....	.....	.....	101	109	273
	Durbhanga	.....	.....	.....	288	.....	10	288	.....	10	288	.....	10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Shahabad	(b) 62	.....	.....	201	2	5	263	2	5	20	2	5	243	.....	.....	30	.....	.....	213	.....	...
	Sarun	1,225	158	9	5,350	395	53	6,575	553	62	30	1	.....	6,545	552	62	.....	5	.....	6,545	547	62
	Chumparun	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
Bhagulpore	Bhagulpore	.....	.....	.....	16	.....	.....	16	.....	.....	16	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Monghyr	584	83	61	.....	.....	.....	584	83	61	.....	.....	.....	584	83	61	.....	.....	.....	584	83	61
	Maldah	8,706	.....	901	.....	.....	61	8,706	.....	962	3,193	.....	653	5,513	.....	309	5,441	.....	309	72	.....	...
	Furneah	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7
	Dumka	.....	1	111	.....	6	108	.....	7	219	.....	.....	.....	.....	7	219	.....	.....	.....	.....	7	219
Chota Nagpore	Lohardugga	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...
	Manbhoom	972	212	57	144	63	12	1,116	275	69	14	3	8	1,102	272	61	.....	.....	.....	1,102	272	61
	Singbhoom	.....	.....	.....	351	.....	.....	351	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	351	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	351	.....	...
	Hazaribagh	.....	.....	.....	73	.....	6	73	.....	6	.....	.....	.....	73	.....	6	.....	.....	.....	73	.....	6
Orissa	Cuttack	.....	.....	71	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	71	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	71	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	71
	Pooree	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	63	.....	.....	63	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	63	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	63
	Balasore	197	.....	83	.....	.....	8	197	.....	91	.....	.....	.....	197	.....	91	197	.....	76	.....	.....	15
Chittagong	Chittagong	383	.....	27	884	22	192	1,267	22	219	329	11	41	938	11	178	.....	.....	.....	938	11	178
	Noakholly	.....	.....	196	.....	.....	308	.....	.....	504	.....	.....	504	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.
	Tipperah	64	.....	24	511	1	25	575	1	49	122	1	25	453	.....	24	5	.....	24	448	.....	
	Total	25,407	2,203	3,975	15,313	1,009	2,542	40,720	3,212	6,517	9,273	473	3,622	31,447	2,740	2,895	6,014	7	421	25,433	2,733	2,474

(a)—The difference between these figures and those shown in column 7 of last year's statement is stated to be owing to non-insertion by oversight of the particulars of the decree which was obtained before the 31st of March 1886.
(b)—The discrepancy is owing to omission of fraction.

H.

General abstract statement showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of Government in the Salt and Opium Departments was realised and what was outstanding on 1st April 1887.

(Blank)

I.

General Abstract Statement of Suits in the Civil Courts of Bengal in which Court of Wards is a party disposed of and pending in the year 1886-87.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	ORIGINAL SUITS.									APPEAL SUITS.										
				DECIDED WITHIN THE YEAR.									DECIDED WITHIN THE YEAR.							
				In favour of Court of Wards.	Against Court of Wards.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						In favour of Court of Wards.	Against Court of Wards.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Remanded.			
DISTRICTS.	Number of suits pending on the 31st March 1886.	Number of suits instituted from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.	Total.	Cases in which Court of Wards is plaintiff. / Cases in which Court of Wards is defendant.	Cases in which Court of Wards is plaintiff. / Cases in which Court of Wards is defendant.	Cases in which Court of Wards is plaintiff. / Cases in which Court of Wards is defendant.	Cases in which Court of Wards is plaintiff. / Cases in which Court of Wards is defendant.	Total.	Pending on the 31st March 1887.	Number of suits pending on the 31st March 1886.	Number of suits instituted from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.	Total.	Cases in which Court of Wards is appellant. / Cases in which Court of Wards is respondent.	Cases in which Court of Wards is appellant. / Cases in which Court of Wards is respondent.	Cases in which Court of Wards is appellant. / Cases in which Court of Wards is respondent.	Cases in which Court of Wards is appellant. / Cases in which Court of Wards is respondent.	Cases in which Court of Wards is appellant. / Cases in which Court of Wards is respondent.	Total.	Pending on 31st March 1887.	Number of cases in which Court of Wards was cost twice.
High Court ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	24	14	38	2	18	2	1	...	...	4	27	11	2
Burdwan	44	107	151	58	2	3	1	1	1	10	6	16	1	6	5	2	...	...	...	14	2	5
Bankoorah	24	47	71	32	2	1	1	...	...	1	1	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	1	1
Beerbhoom ...	(a) 4	11	15	4	2	...	2	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
Midnapore	11	30	41	15	4	1	3	...	4	...	5	6	...	1	...	2	...	...	...	3	3	...
Hooghly	32	114	146	55	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	1
24-Pergunnahs ...	2	8	10	7	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nuddea	5	33	38	32	1	...	...	...	...	3	5	8	1	5	1	1	...	...	...	8	...	1
Jessore	6	105	111	97	1	...	...	2	...	3	...	103	8	...	2	2	...	2	...	...	2	...
Khoolna	(b) 2	52	54	20	2	...	...	22	...	...	...	53	1	1	2	3	1	2	...	...	3	...
Moorshedabad ...	(c) 6	9	15	9	1	...	2	...	...	1	...	13	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dinagepore	6	34	40	22	2	1	...	13	1	...	...	39	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rajshahye	9	9	18	11	2	1	1	...	...	...	...	15	3	3	...	3	...	...	1	2	1	1
Rungpore	1	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pubna	4	336	340	125	...	210	2	...	...	1	...	338	2	...	92	92	...	3	...	3	89	...
Bogra	1	2	3	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Darjeeling	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dacca	(d) 4	4	8	5	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	8	...	(d) 10	4	14	...	2	3	3	8	6	3
Furreedpore ...	4	5	9	2	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	5	4	1	2	3	1	...	...	1	2	1	...
Backergunge ...	2	53	55	39	2	1	3	3	...	2	...	50	5	1	4	5	...	...	1	...	1	4	1
Mymensingh ...	16	12	28	9	...	...	3	...	...	1	...	13	15	...	6	6	...	...	3	...	3	3	...
Chittagong	6	25	31	1	17	...	3	...	...	...	...	21	10	2	11	13	1	5	1	1	9	4	1
Noakhally	1	25	26	10	2	...	5	...	3	...	...	20	6	2	...	2	1	...	...	...	2	...	...
Tipperah	9	60	69	56	4	...	...	...	...	2	...	62	7	3	1	4	...	2	1	1	4	...	1
Patna	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sarun	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gya	6	9	15	1	1	...	2	...	...	...	...	4	11	2	5	7	2	2	...	1	6	1	...
Shahabad	...	6	6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Durbhunga ...	1	2	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mozufferpore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	6	8	...	3	5	...	8	...	5
Monghyr	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bhagulpore	4	3	7	5	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	1	3	1	4	...	2	...	...	3	1	...
Dumka	(e) ...	32	32	26	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	26	6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Maldah	8	6	14	12	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	13	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Purneah	1	1	2	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cuttack	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	1	...	1
Pooree	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hazaribagh ...	19	77	96	86	...	5	2	...	...	2	...	95	1	...	4	4	...	...	...	...	...	4	...
Manbhoom ...	2	4	6	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3	...	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	2	...
Lohardugga ...	128	336	464	165	...	8	1	...	...	19	1	194	270	1	1	2	1	...	1	...	2	...	1
Total ...	366	1,589	1,955	916	54	235	34	41	9	31	2	1,322	603	72	175	247	11	53	27	14	...	1	...	...	2	5	113	134	24

(a) The difference of three cases is owing to those cases having been entered twice in the statement of last year.
(b) The discrepancy of one case is owing to the release of the Ramnagur estate from the management of the Court of Wards.
(c) The discrepancy of two cases is owing to a mistake of the Manager in showing them as pending, although they were decided during last year.
(d) The discrepancy is owing to seven appeal cases having been inadvertently shown among original suits in the statement of last year.
(e) The case shown as pending in the statement of last year belongs to the Purneah district, where it has this year been shown.

J.

Statement showing the amount expended in litigation as contrasted with the sums actually realized by the Court of Wards under decrees of Court from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.

Districts.	Names of Estates.	Nature of Receipts.				Nature of Disbursements.					
		Decrees in civil suits.	Decrees in Privy Council appeals.	Decrees in miscellaneous cases.	Total.	Amount, including costs awarded against Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits.	In defence of suits.	In Privy Council appeals.	Miscellaneous expenses.	Total.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Hooghly ...	Sultangacha estate ...	468	.....	.....	468	9[illegible]	201	27	.....	580	89[illegible]
Burdwan ...	Burdwan Raj estate ...	36,545	.....	23,799	60,344	3,897	25,897	2,754	400	16,695	49,643
	Madhupore " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Khandari " ...	(Released.)									
	Chowghoria " ...			.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total ...	36,545	.....	23,799	60,344	3,897	25,897	2,754	400	16,695	49,643
Bankoorah...	Supur estate	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	65	.....	.....	16	81
Midnapore	Jamirapal estate ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Belki " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Pathra " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Beraberia " ...	170	.....	.....	170	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Nischinta " ...	524	.....	.....	524	.....	.....	600	.....	109	709
	Maligbati " ...	109	.....	.....	109	.....	.....	9	.....	12	21
	Khettrohat " ...	3,210	.....	.....	3,210	.....	.....	1,039	.....	.....	1,039
	Basudebpore " ...	2,744	.....	.....	2,744	.....	.....	.....	.....	137	137
	Beluria " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Tarkua " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Barutter Hinglee " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	2
	Nayabasan " ..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Jhargram " ...	(Released.)		.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total ..	6,757	.....	.....	6,757	.....	2	1,648	.....	258	190
Jessore ...	Narail estate	1,101	.....	.....	1,101	515	1,059	1,654	.....	506	3,734
Moorshedabad ...	Nashipore estate (mal)..	9,843	.....	.....	9,843	246	.....	.....	.....	.....	246
	Ditto " (debutter)	1,586	.....	.....	1,586	1,795	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,795
	Cassimbazar "	5,140	.....	.....	5,140	430	1,880	299	.....	8,993	11,602
	Sydabad	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total ...	16,569	.....	.....	16,569	2,471	1,880	299	.....	8,993	13,643
Khoolna ...	Ramnuggur estate ...	(Released.)									
	Syudpore Trust " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	85	.....	.....	85
Nuddea ...	Nuddea estate	3,144	.....	.....	3,144	.....	4 6	165	.....	326	897
24-Pergunnahs.	Baranagore estate ...	225	.....	.....	225	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	250
	Bhowanipore " ...	513	.....	.....	513	.....	9	.....	.....	432	441
	Joynagore " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Belghoria " ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Bawali " ...	(Released.)									
	Total ...	738	.....	.....	738	.....	9	.....	.....	682	691
Dinagepore	Chooramon estate ...	438	.....	.....	438	.....	65	.....	.....	25	90
	Haripore " ...	256	.....	.....	256	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Sunkerpore " ...	89	.....	.....	89	.....	17	.....	.....	.....	17
	Maldwar " ...	3,141	.....	.....	3,141	.....	2,136	197	.....	46	2,379
	Total ...	3,924	.....	.....	3,924	.....	2,218	197	.....	71	2,486
Rungpore ...	Burdhhankotee estate ..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rajshahye	Chowgong estate ...	(Released.)		.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Dighaputea " (eldest ward.)	12,285	.....	360	12,645	.....	7,890	1,046	.....	348	9,284
	Dighaputea " (three younger wards).	60	.....	.....	60	.....	9,939	360	.....	20	10,319
	Putea estate	10	.....	.....	10	.....	843	120	.....	393	1,356
	Total ...	12,355	.....	360	12,715	.....	18,672	1,526	.....	761	20,959
Julpigori ...	Padmabati estate ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Dacca ...	Lolit Mohan Roy's estate	722	.....	.....	722	50	524	35	.....	131	740
Mymensingh.	Dhunkura estate ...	Statement not received, though repeated reminders sent.									
	Pogose " ...	28	.....	.....	28	.....	6	.....	.....	235	241
	Hurgovind Luskur's estate.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total ...	28	.....	.....	28	.....	6	.....	.....	235	241
Backergunge.	Taruck Kumar Chuckrabutty's estate.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	27	.....	.....	.....	27
	Bepin Behary Dass's estate.	30	.....	.....	30	.....	.....	.....	.....	202	202
	Nobo Doorga Debya's estate.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Dukhin Shabazpore estate.	2,039	.....	.....	2,039	131	734	88	.....	21	974
	Total ...	2,069	.....	.....	2,069	131	761	88	.....	223	1,203

J—*concluded.*

Districts.	Names of Estates.	Nature of Receipts.				Nature of Disbursements.					
		Decrees in civil suits.	Decrees in Privy Council appeals.	Decrees in miscellaneous cases.	Total.	Amount, including costs awarded against Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits.	In defence of suits.	In Privy Council appeals.	Miscellaneous expenses.	Total.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs	Rs	Rs.	Rs.
Tipperah ...	Basarut Ali Chowdhry's estate.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30	.....	1,610	1,640
Chittagong	Hedait Ali Chowdhuri's estate.	.....	.....	.....	...	.....	10	.....	.....	.....	10
	Magan Dass Roy's estate	81	.....	.....	81	.....	78	.....	...	.....	78
	Noyan Tara Chowdhurani's estate.	11	.....	.....	11	37	58	.....	.....	..	95
	Rajkissen Banerji's estate.	1,001	.....	.....	1,001	.....	112	.....	.....	.....	112
	Fuzl Ahmed Chowdhuri's estate.	132	.....	.....	132	.....	89	.....	.....	..	89
	Fuzl Ali Khan's estate	21	...	.....	21	..	71	.....	.....	14	85
	Abdul Futteh Khan's estate.		.....	...	.....	25	87	.....	.....	.....	112
	Total ..	1,246	.....	.....	1,246	62	505	.....	..	14	581
Noakhally	Gunga Churn Mozumdar's estate.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.	.....	.....	21	21
	Courjon estate ...	.....	.....	751	751	..	147	8,704	...	281	9,132
	Panameah's estate	.....	.....	.....	...	...			..		.....
	Bhobonjoy Shaha's estate	139	...	272	411	.....	111	246	..	253	610
	Total ..	139	.....	1,023	1,162	.....	258	8,950	.....	555	9,763
Durbhanga .	Nurhan estate	13,245	...		13,245	.....	32	677	.....	2,725	3,434
Shahabad	Desputty Singh's estate	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...	..	.....
	Roghunandan Prosad Singh's estate.	2,322	.....	.....	2,322	.....	.....	.....		.....	.
	Total ..	2,322	.....	...	2,322	.....	...	.....	...	.....	..
Patna ...	Bhagwant Narain Sing's estate.	13	.....	.....	13	.....	.....	.....	...	25	25
	Debi Prosad Lunatic's estate	1,509	.....	.....	1,509	.....	.....	.....	..	352	352
	Bhagwat Prosad's estate.	20	.....	..	20	.....	595	.....	...	127	722
	Total	1,542	...	.....	1,542	.....	595	..		504	1,099
Gya	Tikari estate	Statement not received, though repeated reminders sent.									
Purneah	Rusulpore estate	2,157	.....	.....	2,157	.....	53	...	..	46	99
	Srinuggur ,,	5,092		.....	5,092	1,836	1,816	154	.....		3,806
	Total	7,249	.....	.....	7,249	1,836	1,869	154	.....	46	3,905
Maldah ...	Chanchal estate	287	.....	.....	287	.....	71	.....	.....	53	124
Bhagulpore	Lugmah estate .	..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Lalpore Patori estate	52	..	..	52	.....	32	.....	.....	.....	32
	Shahpore estate ..	(Released)			.....	.....	.	.....	.....	..	.....
	Total ..	52	.....		52	.....	32	.....	.....	...	32
Pooree ...	Wards' estates		.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Manbhoom	Jhalda estate	.....			.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Begunkoodar ,, .				.....	...	226	50	.....	14	290
	Nowagurh ,,	(Released)		..		.....		.....	...	.....	.....
	Total	...	.....	.....	..	.....	226	50	...	14	290
Lohardugga	Chota Nagpore estate ..	204	.....	21,283	21,487	.....	325	201	.....	5,142	5,668
	Punjrikalan ,,	.....		..	.....	.....	.....				..
	Total	204	..	21,283	21,487	.....	325	201	.....	5,142	5,668
Hazaribagh	Dhunwar estate .	32	.	4,448	4,480	179	.....	38	.....	2,373	2,590
	Serampore	166		1,964	2,130	..	.....	.....	.....	616	616
	Jiridih ,, . ..		.	26	26	...	152	...	.....	609	761
	Satgawan ,, ..			.....	.	..	...	.....	.....	...	.....
	Total .	198	.....	6,438	6,636	179	152	38	.....	3,598	3,967
	Grand Total ...	1,10,904	..	52,903	1,63,807	9,232	55,765	18,578	400	43,733	1,27,713

D

K.

General Abstract Statement showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of Court of

Division.	District.	Name of Estate.	Outstanding on 1st April 1886.			Awarded in favour of Court of Wards from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.			Total.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Burdwan	Hooghly... ...	Sultangacha estate ...	17,660	3,721	4,654	384	.....	636	18,044	3,721	5,290
	Burdwan ...	Burdwan Raj estate...	(a) 2,07,329	(a) 31,813	8296	85,654	13,066	4,565	2,92,983	44,879	12,861
		Modhupore estate ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Khandari ,,	(Released).								
		Chowghoria ,,									
		Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Bankoora ...	Supur estate	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Midnapore ...	Jamirapal estate ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Belki ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	.....
		Pathra ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...	...	.....
		Beraberia ,, ...	307	185	189	.....	.....	.....	307	185	189
		Nischinta ,, ...	1,586	784	1,053	.....	106	109	1,586	890	1,162
		Malighati ,, ...	369	74	117	.	2	3	369	76	120
		Khettrohat ,, ...	2,988	519	108	15,191	1,308	130	18,179	1,827	238
		Basudebpore ,, .	(b) 22,199	(b) 4,571	(b) 2,292	296	15	19	22,495	4,586	2,311
		Boluria ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Turkua ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Barutter Hingleo ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	20	4	2	20	4	2
		Nayabasan ,, ...	.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Jhargram ,, ...	(Released).								
		Total .	27,449	6,133	3,739	15,507	1,435	263	42,956	7,568	4,002
Presidency.	Jessore ...	Narail estate ...	(c) 15,696	(c) 4,237	(c) 631	2,675	143	530	18,361	4,380	1,161
	Moorshedabad	Nashipore estate (mal)	4,390	1,677	1,013	5,901	1,009	721	10,291	2,686	1,734
		,, ,, (debutter).	.....	.....	.....	1,323	116	147	1,323	116	147
		Cassimbazar estate ..	13,900	286	431	3,838	912	1,766	17,747	1,198	2,179
		Sydabad ,, ...	.....	.....	... .	.....	.....	... ..	.....	.....	. .
		Total ...	18,299	1,963	1,444	11,062	2,037	2,634	29,361	4,000	4,078
	Khoolna ...	Ramnuggur estate .	(Released).								
		Syudpore ,, ...	.....	.....	.....		.....	85	... ..	.....	85
	Nuddea ..	Nuddea estate ...	2,603	198	254	2,540	759	604	5,143	957	858
	24-Pergunnahs	Baranagore estate ...	2,337	205	128	207	28	28	2,544	233	156
		Bhowanipore ,, ...	2,595	45	105	2,403	176	62	4,998	221	167
		Joynagore ,, ..	.....	.....	.....	.. ..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Belghoria ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
		Bawali ,, ...	(Released).								
		Total ...	4,932	250	233	2,610	204	90	7,542	454	323
Rajshahye and Cooch Behar.	Dinagepore ...	Chooramon estate ...	(d) 1,219	(d) 311	(d) 178	121	13	180	1,340	324	353
		Haripore ,, ...	451	271	130	.....	9	.....	451	280	130
		Sunkerpore ,, ...	.....	.....	.....	61	11	17	61	11	17
		Maldwar ,, ...	5,407	978	(e) 2,105	12,042	3,238	2,115	17,449	4,216	4,220
		Total	7,077	1,560	2,408	12,224	3,271	2,3 2	19,301	4 831	4,720
	Rungpore ...	Burdhankotee estate..	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	.	..	.. ..	.....
	Rajshahye ...	Chowgong estate	(Released.)								
		Dighaputea estate (eldest ward).	40,826	14,436	8,161	11,093	1,000	3,044	60,919	15,436	11,205
		Dighaputea estate (3 younger wards).	1,181	114	166	1,79,930	13,620	7,928	1,81,111	13,734	8,094
		Putea estate	798	206	107	335	62	80	1,133	268	187
		Total ..	51,805	14,756	8,434	1,91,358	14,682	11,052	2,43,163	29,438	19,486
	Julpigoree ...	Padmabati estate ...	....	.. ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Dacca.	Dacca ...	Lolit Mohon Roy's estate.	22	3	21	620	19	37	642	22	58
	Mymensingh ..	Dhunkura estate ...							Statement not received		
		Pogose ,, ...	15	1	23	2	1	7	17	2	30
		Hurgovind Luskur's estate.	... ..	.....	.....	.....	.....	... ..	.....	.....	.. ..
		Total ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

(a) The discrepancy is owing to Rs. 2,784 not having been included in
(b) The discrepancies are owing to non-inclusion of certain decrees
(c) The discrepancies are owing to addition and rejection of figures on
(d) The difference is on account of the addition of certain decrees
(e) Ditto ditto ditto

Wards in the Revenue Department was realized, and what was outstanding on the 1st April 1887.

Realized during 1886-87.			Balance.			Remitted by competent authority.			Net balance.		
Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
468	.....	.....	17,576	3,721	5,290	2,251	.....	425	15,325	3,721	4,865
46,952	7,930	5,462	2,46,031	36,949	7,399	1,160	953	9	2,44,871	35,996	7,390
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....		.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
170	.....	.....	137	185	169	.....	.....	.....	137	185	169
499	14	11	1,087	876	1,151	4	.....	.....	1,083	876	1,151
104	2	3	265	74	117	.....	.....	.....	265	74	117
2,670	490	50	15,509	1,337	188	.....	.....	.....	15,509	1,337	188
2,528	62	154	19,267	4,524	2,157	726	400	246	19,241	4,124	1,911
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	20	4	2	.....	.....	.....	20	4	2
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
5,971	568	218	36,985	7,000	3,784	730	400	246	36,255	6,600	3,538
743	72	286	17,618	4,308	875	.....	.....	.....	17,618	4,308	875
7,916	1,106	819	2,375	1,578	915	929	8	42	1,446	1,570	873
1,323	116	147	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
3,407	782	951	14,340	416	1,246	1,915	225	721	12,425	191	523
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
12,646	2,006	1,917	16,715	1,994	2,161	2,844	233	765	13,871	1,761	1,396
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	85
2,152	407	585	2,991	550	273	.....	10	.....	2,991	540	273
198	1	26	2,346	232	130	.....	.....	.....	2,346	232	130
397	36	80	4,601	185	87	.....	.....	.....	4,601	185	87
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
595	37	106	6,947	417	217	.....	.....	.....	6,947	417	217
222	62	154	1,118	252	199	185	8	60	933	254	139
136	82	38	315	198	97	100	34	26	215	164	66
61	11	17	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1,566	273	1,302	15,883	3,943	2,918	294	59	158	15,589	3,884	2,760
1,985	428	1,511	17,316	4,403	3,209	579	101	244	16,737	4,302	2,965
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
10,404	642	1,599	50,515	14,794	9,606	.....	.....	.....	50,515	14,794	9,606
41	3	16	1,81,070	13,731	8,078	.....	.....	.....	1,81,070	13,731	8,078
10	.....	.....	1,123	268	187	.....	.....	.....	1,123	268	187
10,455	645	1,615	2,32,708	28,793	17,871	.....	.....	.....	2,32,708	28,793	17,871
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
642	22	58	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
though repeated reminders sent.											
8	1	19	9	1	11	.....	.....	.....	9	1	11
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

the manager's statement of last year.
awarded by the Appellate Court during the last year.
account of the Rosulpore estate, and also of decrees barred by limitation.
which were inadvertently not shown in the statement of last year.
ditto ditto ditto ditto.

Division.	Districts.	Name of Estates.	Outstanding on 1st April 1886.			Awarded in favour of Court of Wards from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.			Total.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interests.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Dacca.	Backergunge ..	Tarak Kumar Chukerbutty's estate.	27	7	23		.....		27	7	23
		Bepin Behary Das' estate.	973	177	230	160	32	202	1,133	209	432
		Noho Durga Debya's estate.		.....	20	.....	..	.. ...	..	.. .	20
		Dukhin Shabaspore estate.	.....		..	7,926	1,794	499	7,926	1,794	499
		Total ...	1,000	184	273	8,086	1,826	701	9,086	2, 010	974
Chittagong.	Tipperah ...	Basarut Ally Chowdhury's estate.	3,377	1,117	626	.....	364	3	3,377	1,481	629
	Chittagong ..	Hedait Ally Chowdhury's estate.	.....	.....	.....	.. ..	7	66		7	66
		Magan Dass Roy's estate.	242	222	205	...	30	27	242	252	232
		Nyan Tara Chowdhrani's estate.	.....	..	...	58	1	98	58	1	98
		Rajkissen Banerjee estate.	59	18	21	979	126	26	1,038	144	47
		Fazl Ahmed Choudhury's estate.	11	....	2	111	.. ..	10	122	..	12
		Fazl Ali Khan's estate	734	106	63	32	30	22	766	136	85
		Abdul Futteh Khan's estate.	...	... ..	.....	178	60	9	178	60	9
		Total ...	1,046	346	291	1,358	254	258	2,404	600	549
	Noakhally ...	Gunga Churn Mozumdar's estate.	43	16	16	22	25	21	65	41	37
		Courjon estate .	855	238	439	. ..	20	23	855	258	462
		Panameah's estate ..	... ..		..	...	...	.	..	.....	... ..
		Bhobonjoy Shaha's estate.	.... .	...	...	756	322	330	756	322	330
		Total ..	898	254	455	778	367	374	1,676	621	829
	Durbhangah ...	Nurhan estate ...	4,293	42,590	5,834	..	1,952	10 7	4,292	44,542	5,941
Patna.	Shahabad ...	Desputty Singh's estate.	6	19	...	... ..	.....	.....	6	19	.....
		Roghunundun Prosad Singh's estate.	2,463	334	157	.....	.....	.....	2,463	334	157
		Total ...	2,469	353	157	.. ..	. ....	.	2,469	353	157
	Patna ...	Bhugwant Narain Singh's estate.	138	19	37	. ..	9	12	138	28	49
		Debi Prosad Lunatic's estate	3,588	168	114	1,192	206	178	4,780	374	292
		Bhugwat Prosad's estate.	215	25	10	.....	6	1	215	31	11
		Total ...	3,941	212	161	1,192	221	191	5,133	433	352
	Gya ...	Tikari estate	Statement not received, though repeated reminders sent.								
Bhagulpore.	Purneah ...	Rusulpore estate ...	1,558	6,474	148	193	24	53	1,751	6,498	201
		Srinuggur " ...	48,428	6,029	7,391	17,452	4,053	3,619	65 880	10,082	11,010
		Total ...	49,986	12,503	7,539	17,645	4,077	3,672	67,631	16,580	11,211
	Maldah ...	Chanchal estate ...	1,475	894	226	313	76	124	1,788	970	350
	Bhagulpore ...	Lugmah estate	.....	.....	.....	... ..	.....	...	. .	.....	.....
		Lalpore Patori estate	.....	.....	.....	111	3	33	111	3	33
		Shahpore estate ...	Released.								
		Total ...	.. ..			...	....	... ..	.....	.....	... ..
Orissa.	Pooree ...	Wards' estates ...	... ..	.....	... .	.. ...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Manbhoom ..	Jhalda estate ...	.....	.....	.....	43	.....	43	43	. .	43
		Begunkoodar " ...	21	.....	... .	38	.....	....	59	.....	.....
		Nowagurh " ...	Released.								
		Total ...	21	.	.....	81	.. ..	43	102	... ..	43
Chota-Nagpore.	Lohurdugga ..	Chota Nagpore estate	(f) 24,370	(f) 6,598	(f) 16,421	18,014	2,772	2,996	42,384	9,370	19,417
		Punjrikalan "	...	.	.. ..	. ..	.....	... ..	..	. .	
		Total ..	... ..	.. ..	.....	.....	...	..	.	....	.....
	Hazaribagh .	Dhunwar estate ...	4,002	909	2,475	2,026	441	1,227	6 028	1,350	3,702
		Serampore "	1,257	145	831	1,426	97	421	2,683	242	1,252
		Jiridih "	17	.....	33	2,201	.....	1,444	2,218	.....	1,477
		Satgawan " ..	.. ..	... ..	...	.	.....		...	. .	..
		Total ...	5,276	1,054	3,339	5,653	538	3,092	10,929	1,592	6,431
		Grand Total ...	4,51,028	1,30,740	65,450	3,77,867	48,067	34,409	8,28,895	1,78,807	99,868

(f) The difference is owing to the amount of three decrees having been

concluded.

Realized during 1886-87.			Balance.			Remitted by Competent Authority.			Net Balance.		
Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.
*Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
.....	.....	.....	27	7	23	.....	.....	.....	27	7	23
10	.....	20	1,123	209	412	.....	.....	.....	1,123	209	412
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	20	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	20
1,646	243	150	6,280	1,551	349	.....	.....	.....	6,280	1,551	349
1,656	243	170	7,430	1,767	804	.....	.....	.....	7,430	1,767	804
.....	.....	.....	3,377	1,481	629	.....	.....	.....	3,377	1,481	629
.....	.....	.....	.....	7	66	.....	.....	.....	.....	7	66
40	.....	41	202	252	191	.....	120	1	202	132	190
8	.....	3	50	1	95	.....	.....	.....	50	1	95
882	100	19	156	44	28	.....	.....	.....	156	44	28
122	.....	10	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2
16	.....	5	750	136	80	.....	.....	.....	750	136	80
.....	.....	.....	178	60	9	.....	.....	.....	178	60	9
1,068	100	78	1,336	500	471	.....	120	1	1,336	380	470
.....	.....	.....	65	41	37	43	.....	.....	22	41	37
618	17	116	237	241	346	.....	6	14	237	235	332
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
191	114	106	565	208	224	25	15	6	540	193	218
809	131	222	867	490	607	68	21	20	799	469	587
..	10,647	2,598	4,292	33,895	3,343	.....	.....	.....	4,292	33,895	3,343
.....	.....	.....	6	19	.....	.....	.....	.....	6	19	.....
1,911	254	157	552	80	.....	.....	.....	.....	552	80	.....
1,911	254	157	558	99	.....	.....	.....	.....	558	99	.....
13	.....	.....	125	28	49	.....	.....	24	125	28	25
1,373	70	66	3,407	304	226	.....	.....	.....	3,407	304	226
20	.....	.....	195	31	11	.....	.....	.....	195	31	11
1,406	70	66	3,727	363	286	..	.....	24	3,727	363	262
831	1,236	90	920	5,262	111	63	16	38	857	5,246	73
3,842	670	580	62,038	9,412	10,430	1,608	115	94	60,430	9,297	10,336
4,673	1,906	670	62,958	14,674	10,541	1,671	131	132	61,287	14,543	10,409
185	45	57	1,603	925	293	.....	.....	.....	1,603	925	293
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
31	1	20	80	2	13	.....	.....	.....	80	2	13
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	43	.....	43	.....	.....	.....	43	.....	43
.....	.....	.....	59	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	59	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	102	.....	43	.....	.....	.....	102	.....	43
16 861	2,070	2,546	25,523	7,291	16,871	2,562	1,057	1,127	22,961	6,234	15,744
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
3,040	560	880	2,988	790	2,822	917	163	647	2,071	627	2,175
1,575	128	427	1,108	114	825	122	4	155	986	110	670
17	.....	9	2,201	.....	1,468	.....	.....	19	2,201	.....	1,449
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
4,632	688	1,316	6,297	904	5,115	1,039	167	821	5,258	737	4,294
1,15,849	28,280	19,677	7,13,946	1,50,527	80,191	12,904	3,193	3,814	7,00,142	1,47,334	76,377

erroneously shown twice in the statement of last year.

L.

General abstract statement showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of Government in Pauper suits was realized and what was outstanding on the 1st April 1887.

Division.	District.	Outstanding on the 1st April 1886.			Awarded in favour of Government from 1st April 1886 to 31st March 1887.			Total.			Realized during 1886-87.			Balance.			Remitted by competent authority.			Net balance.			Expended during the year.
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Burdwan	Burdwan	827	.....	.....	256	..	.....	1,083	.....	...	469	.....		614	..	.....	96	.....	.....	518	.....	.....	99
	Beerbhoom	...	.....	.....	...	.....	...	...	.....	.	.	.....		..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	.
	Bankoora	940	1	74	484	.....	101	1,424	1	175	259	1	46	1,165	.....	129	.....	.....	.	1,165	...	129	2
	Midnapore	9,718	.....	81	2,937	.....	29	12,655	.....	110	1,032	.....	29	11,623	..	81	.....	.....	.....	11,623	.....	81	29
	Hooghly	5,153	.....	219	1,875	.....	107	7,028	.....	326	522	.....	133	6,506		193	2,347	.....	26	4,159	.....	167	127
Presidency	24-Pergunnahs	6,336	.....	275	4,646	.....	138	10,882	.....	413	1,482	.....	87	9,400	...	326	220	...	.....	9,180	.....	326	234
	Nuddea	.....	.....	...	..	.....	...	.	.....	.....	.....	.....	...	..	.....	.	...	...	.....	...	..	..	...
	Jessore	1,176	...	75	2,210	.....	60	3,386	.....	135	307	.....	17	3,079	.....	118	...	..	....	3,079	...	118	60
	Khoolna	1,727	.....	14	384	.....	83	2,111	...	97	89	.....	...	2,022	.....	97	...	...	...	2,022	.....	97	3
	Moorshedabad	377	...	5	3,150	.....	31	3,527	...	36	2,192	.....	31	1,335	.	5	114	..	...	1,221	.	5	..
Rajshahye and Cooch Behar	Rajshahye	3,958	.....	20	123	.....	7	4,081	...	27	123	.....	.....	3,958	..	27	580	...	20	3,378	.....	7	5
	Rungpore	..	.....	.....	.....		.....	.....	.....	...	..	.....	.....	..	..	..	.....	.....	...	..	.....	..	.....
	Dinagepore	...	.....	51	...	.....	1	.....	.	52	..	...	1	.....	...	51	...	.....	51	..	.....	.....	...
	Pubna	.....	.....	178	.....	....	.....	.....	.	178	....	.....	.....	.	.....	178	.	.....	178	...	.....	..	.....
	Julpigoree	.....	.....	.	.....	.....	....	.....	.	.....	.....	.....	.....	..	.....	.	..	.....	...	.....	.....	.	.....
Dacca	Dacca	(a) 9,044	.....	283	2,469	.....	60	11,513	.....	343	547	...	29	10,966	.	314	.....	.....	.....	10,966	.....	314	60
	Mymensingh	67	...	14	67	....	....	134	.....	14	45	....	...	89	.....	14	22	.....	14	67	.....	.....	...
	Furreedpore	276	6	36	...	5	12	276	11	42	24	11	16	252	...	26	.....	.....	...	252	....	26	...
	Backergunge	1,388	.....	56	751	.....	67	2,139	.....	117	223	..	6	1,916	...	111	37	....	23	1,879	...	88	67
Patna	Patna	3,026	...		1,058	...	3	4,084	.....	3		.....	.....	4,084	...	3	...	.....	.....	4,084	...	3	15
	Mozufferpore	433	...	226	331	.....	88	766	.	314	200	.....	.....	566	..	314	430	.....	...	136	.....	314	2
	Gya	3,501	89	83	177	2	11	3,681	91	99	250	.....	.....	3,431	91	99	...	.....	.....	3,431	91	99	30
	Durbhunga	356	.....	...	.....	.....	.....	356	.....	.....	77	.....	...	279	.	....	.....	.....	.....	279	...	..	14
	Shahabad	(b) 763	...	21	164	.....	14	927	.....	35	4	.....	14	923	.....	21	...	.....	....	923	..	21	22
	Sarun	.....	.....	108	.....	.....	259	.....	.....	367	...	..	242	....	.	125	.....	.....	2	..	.....	123	259
Bhagulpore	Bhagulpore	.....	.....	...	....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	...	....	.....	.	...	.....	.....	...
	Monghyr	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	...	..	.....	.....	.	....	.....	.....	...	..	....	.....	..	..	.....	.	...
	Maldah	(c) 310	.....	...	70	.....	18	380	...	18	310	.....	18	70	.....	..	...	...	.....	70	.	...	19
	Purneah	.....	.....	..	.....	..	..	..	.....	....	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....	..	..	.....	...	.....	.....	.....
	Dumka	.....	.....	...	.....	....	.	.	.	.....	...	..	...	...	.	.....	....	.....	.....	...	.....	..	...
Chota Nagpore	Lohardugga	..	.....	....	.....	.....	.....	...	.....	....	...	.....	.....	..	...	..	...	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	.....
	Manbhoom	468	..	22	117	.....	.....	585	...	22	27	.....	.....	558	.....	22	.....	.....	.....	558	.....	22	
	Singbhoom	..	...	.....	125	...	.....	125	....	.....	99	....	.....	26	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	26	...	...	.
	Hazaribagh	.....	....	.....	175	.....	.....	175	...	...	.	...	.....	175	...	..	175	.....	.	...	...	.	..
Orissa	Cuttack	.....	32	(d) 1,996	.....	....	155	.....	32	2,150	.....	3	672	.....	29	1,478	.....	.....	468	.....	29	1,010	.....
	Pooree	.....	.	2,086	.....	....	126	...	..	2,212	....	...	560	..	...	1,652	...	...	..	.	.....	1,652	...
	Balasore	..	....	..	.....	...	136	.....	...	136	.....	.....	.....	...	..	136	.....	...	.....	...	.....	136	....
Chittagong	Chittagong	.....	.....	...	380	.....	30	380	.....	30	258	.....	11	122	...	19	.....	.....	.....	122	...	19	30
	Noakholly	.....	.....	669	.....	.....	51	...	...	720	...	....	10	.....	.....	710	.....	.....	25		-	685	.....
	Tipperah	466	...	42	875	.....	17	1,341	...	59	9		47	1,332	..	12	.....	.....	.....	1,332	.....	12	13
	Total	50,212	128	6,626	22,827	7	1,604	73,039	135	8,230	8,548	15	1,969	64,491	120	6,261	4,021	..	807	60,470	120	5,454	1,089

(a) The discrepancy is owing to Rs. 71 in two cases having been ordered by the appellate court to be realized from parties other than those from whom they were ordered to be realized by the first court; the amount has been struck off from the demand of the previous year and added to that of the current year.

(b) The difference of Rs. 41 between the figures of this column and those of column 7 of last year's return is owing to that sum having on appeal been adjudged against defendant. The amount has accordingly been struck out of the demand of the previous year and added to column 3 as awarded during the year.

(c) The discrepancy of Rs. 29 is owing to amendment of certain decrees.

(d) The discrepant amount was wrongly entered by the Collector in his statement of last year. It has been transferred to Balasore.

E. D'S. & others—Reg. No. 5337J—181—25-7-87.

RESOLUTION.

JUDICIAL.

Calcutta, the 5th September 1887.

READ—

The Report on the Legal Affairs of the Government of Bengal for the year 1886-87.

Read also—

The Reports for the two preceding years, and the orders of Government thereon.

The following statement shows the result of Government litigation in all the Civil Courts of Bengal during the year 1886-87 as compared with the two previous years:—

	1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government ...	448	576	742
Decided against Government ...	148	92	167
Compromised, remanded or withdrawn	102	340	142
Percentage in favour of Government ...	75	86¼	81½

The increase is due to a large number of land acquisition cases in connection with the Kidderpore Wet-dock.

2. The result of Government litigation in the High Court only was as follows:—

	1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government ...	24	28	30
Decided against Government ...	1	4	77
Compromised, remanded or withdrawn	4	305	2
Percentage in favour of Government ...	96	87½	28

The Legal Remembrancer points out that the low percentage of cases decided in favour of Government is due to the fact that 66 enhancement of rent-suits from Malinaggar, in the district of Mozufferpore, were decided by the High Court against the Government in two special appellate decisions, each governing a number of cases. Even if the 66 cases be treated as two cases, the percentage of decisions in favour of Government would still be far from good. The Lieutenant-Governor is satisfied that in many of the cases noticed in the Report, the Government had no reasonable grounds to go upon, and such cases should not have been taken into or defended in Court. The Legal Remembrancer will be asked to report specially on this point, and to state whether he can suggest any means whereby a more careful examination of the probabilities of success may be made in the first instance, and a stricter watch kept over the progress of cases afterwards. The attention of the Revenue Department will also be called to this matter.

3. Sir Steuart Bayley does not deem it necessary to discuss the details of the various cases which have been decided against Government. With reference to the case under Act XI of 1859 mentioned by Mr. Allen in paragraph 12 of his Report, the suggestion made by him will be considered in the Revenue Department. On the data now before him, the Lieutenant-Governor is certainly of opinion that the Commissioner or the Board of Revenue would have done well to cancel the sale.

4. Perhaps the most important case during the year was the Deara Survey case, in the district of Furreedpore, in which a quantity of land was resumed as new accretions, and assessed under the provisions of Act IX of 1847. The plaintiffs instituted a suit against Government claiming the land as a re-formation on the site of their permanently-settled mouzah. The Government urged that the lands being liable to assessment under Act IX of 1847, the Civil Court had no jurisdiction to entertain the suit. This contention was disallowed by the Court of first instance, but allowed by the District Judge on appeal. On a second appeal to the High Court, the question of jurisdiction was referred to a Full Bench and decided against the Government. The Legal Remembrancer has made the following remarks regarding this case: "The question whether the land is liable to assessment, or already covered by an existing settlement, appears to have been always reserved for the decision of the Revenue authorities, and section 6 of Act IX of 1847 declares the Board's decision final in such a case. This judgment of the Full Bench, ignoring this principle, and overruling previous decisions of the High Court itself, has been appealed to Her Majesty in Council."

5. The result of Government litigation in the lower appellate Courts was as follows:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government	...	111	29	25
Decided against Government	...	8	17	7
Compromised, remanded, or withdrawn	...	8	...	17
Percentage in favour of Government	...	93	63	78

As regards the seven suits decided against Government, Sir Steuart Bayley would only remark that the suits mentioned in paragraphs 20 and 21, which were brought for the cancellation of certificates issued under Act VII (B.C.) of 1880, show the necessity for the exercise of caution and supervision in the application of the certificate procedure.

6. The following was the result of Government litigation in the Courts of first instance:—

		1884-85	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Government	...	313	519	687
Decided against Government ...	...	139	71	83
Compromised, or withdrawn ...	...	90	35	123
Percentage in favour of Government	...	69	88	89

The increase in the number of cases is due to there having been an unusually large number of land acquisition cases in the districts of the 24-Pergunnahs, Patna, and Dacca. Of the 83 cases decided against Government, 21 were cases under the Land Acquisition Act, in which the Judge awarded larger amounts of compensation than had been offered by the Collector. Of the remaining cases, 35 were brought by the tenants of Bokalia, in the district of Chittagong, for a reduction in the rent assessed on them under Act VIII (B.C.) of 1879. In these cases appeals have been instituted in the District Judge's Court against the decisions of the Munsif. The result of the appeal filed in the case arising out of an alleged encroachment on a public road mentioned in paragraph 31 of the Report, should be specially reported. The suit, brought by the Maharajah of Durbhunga against the Chairman of the Durbhunga Municipality, for the recovery of a piece of land which had been acquired by Government, is one of great importance, as affecting the powers of a Manager under the Court of Wards. The Legal Remembrancer should see that the case on behalf of Government is properly and thoroughly placed before the High Court on appeal. This remark also applies to the case mentioned in paragraph 38, as the question as to the existence of any transferable right is one of great importance. As remarked by the Collector, the judgment, if not upset on appeal, will certainly form a most inconvenient precedent.

7. The figures below show the result of the litigation in which the Court of Wards were concerned for the year under report as compared with the two preceding years:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
Decided in favour of Court of Wards	...	700	1,113	1,034
Decided against Court of Wards	...	121	158	310
Compromised, remanded or withdrawn	...	56	44	91
Percentage in favour of Court of Wards		85¼	87½	77

The low percentage is said to be due to the fact that 210 cases instituted by the Manager of the Dighapatia Estate for recovery of arrears of rent were decided against the Court of Wards during the year. Appeals have been preferred in these cases.

8. The following table shows the amount of Government decrees recovered during 1886-87, as compared with the amounts recovered during the two previous years:—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Amount under realization	...	6,42,647	6,26,182	50,449
Realized during the year	...	20,407	12,338	13,367
Percentage of recovery	...	3½	2	26½

Omitting the Canning decrees which were remitted in the previous year, the amount under realization in 1885-86 was only Rs. 44,903, or less than in the present year. The percentage of recovery on that amount was Rs. 27½,

so that the percentage has dropped by 1 per cent. during the year under report.

9. The amount of Wards' decrees recovered during 1886-87, as compared with the realizations of the two preceding years, was as follows :—

		1884-85.	1885-86.	1886-87.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Amount under realization	...	5,72,757	9,37,524	11,07,570
Realized during the year	...	1,02,253	1,69,179	1,63,806
Percentage of recovery	...	19¾	18	14⅞

The Lieutenant-Governor is of opinion that the percentage of recovery, both on Government decrees and Wards' decrees, is exceedingly bad. The most unsatisfactory feature of Government litigation in Bengal is that Government must of course make good to the uttermost farthing all adverse decrees, while it experiences the greatest difficulty in realizing the decrees in its favour, some of them being wholly infructuous. The Board of Revenue are of opinion that what is necessary to improve realization is greater energy on the part of the officers in the Execution Department. This remark of course applies only to Wards' decrees. As regards Government decrees, Sir Steuart Bayley agrees with the opinion of his predecessor that small collections are due in a great measure to the facility for concealing property, to the joint family system, and to the prevalence of *benamee* transactions, which offer almost insuperable obstacles to the realization of decrees, even by private persons. Sir Steuart Bayley has no doubt that the offences of fraudulent concealment, removal, or transfer of property are of frequent occurrence in Bengal. Collectors, however, have some remedy in their own hands, as they might apply to the Magistrate in any fitting case to issue process under section 424 of the Penal Code, an offence, for the prosecution of which no sanction is required. The Lieutenant-Governor is not aware whether a commission upon realizations is now paid to Nazirs and their subordinates. If not, he thinks that the experiment might be tried. The Legal Remembrancer will be asked to reports on this point. Statement E appended to the Report shows that the amount expended in litigation by Government during the year was Rs. 48,368, while the receipts amounted to only Rs. 13,367.

ORDER.—Ordered that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Superintendent and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs for information and submission of the report called for in paragraphs 2, 6 and 9.

Ordered also that a copy of this Resolution, with a copy of the Report, be forwarded to the Revenue Department of this Office with special reference to the remarks contained in paragraph 2.

By order of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal,

J. WARE EDGAR,

Offg. Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Bengal.

No. 3955J.

COPY of this Resolution forwarded to the Superintendent and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs for information.

No. 3956J.

COPY of Report and Resolution forwarded to the Revenue Department of this Office for a consideration of those cases in which the Civil Courts have given decrees, cancelling revenue sales, and also of the case mentioned in paragraph 14 of the Report.

By order of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal,

H. A. D. PHILLIPS,

Under-Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

CALCUTTA,

The 15th September 1887.

W. LeB.—Reg. No. 8053C—135—17-9-87.